



Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-106S
Thursday
2 June 1988

Soviet Union SUPPLEMENT

FBIS-SOV-88-106

CONTENTS

2 June 1988

USSR-U.S. SUMMIT

PRAVDA Reports 30 May Summit Talks Session [1 Jun]	1
Further Reportage on Leaders' 31 May Activities	1
Press Briefing Before Talks [PRAVDA]	1
TV Shows Luncheon With Artists	1
IZVESTIYA Reports Artists Meeting [2 Jun]	2
University Speech Reported	3
TV Reports University Speech	5
TV Reports Answers to Students	6
Further on Reagan, Students [IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]	6
Students Comment on Meeting [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Jun]	7
TV Reports Gorbachev, Yakovlev Walk	9
Guest List at 31 May Dinner [PRAVDA 1 Jun]	9
TASS Rounds Up Third Day	9
Reagan's Activities Reviewed [PRAVDA 1 Jun]	10
Reagan Activities, Meetings of 1 Jun Reported	12
'Final Meeting' Begins	12
Reagan, Gorbachev Brief Press	12
Further on Briefing	13
Delegation Members Listed	13
Ratification Instruments Exchanged	13
Gorbachev Speech at Ratification	14
Reagan Speaks on Ratification [PRAVDA 2 Jun]	15
Officials' Attendance Noted	16
Joint Summit Statement	16
Gorbachev Press Statement	22
Gorbachev Answers Questions	28
Reagan News Conference	37
Gerasimov, Fitzwater Briefing [IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]	42
Visit to Bolshoy Ballet	43
Activities of Leaders' Spouses Reported	43
Mrs Reagan Visits Leningrad [PRAVDA 1 Jun]	43
Gorbacheva Addresses Peace Groups	43
Visit to Art Gallery	44
Reagan Departure From Moscow 2 Jun Reported	44
Gorbachev Bids Reagan Farewell	44
Gorbachev Speech at Ceremony	44
Reagan Farewell Speech	45
Reagan Departs Moscow	45
Gromyko, Others See Reagan Off	45
Gorbachev Sees Representatives of 'World Public'	46
Praises 'Activists' Role	46
Discusses Human Rights Talks	46
Urges 'Respect' for Political Choice	47
Receives U.S. Church Delegation	47
Yazov-Carlucci Talks 'Frank,' 'Constructive' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jun]	48
Carlucci on Summit	48
Yakovlev Receives Scientific Workers Delegation	48
Wick, Losev Discuss Media Cooperation	48
Ridgway, Nitze Comment on Joint Statement	48
Senators Dole, Byrd Hold News Conference	49
Further Reportage on Soviet-U.S. Agreements	49
Search, Rescue Accord Detailed	49
Transport Agreement Outlined	49

Reagan 'Platitudes' on Rights Deplored [PRAVDA 31 May]	49
Shishlin Views Results of Summit Talks	51
Zagladin, Arbatov, Redman View Summit [Warsaw Television]	52
Arbatov Discusses 'Tact' of President, Entourage [Warsaw Television]	53
OGONEK Editor Says Summit Produced 'Trust'	53
Shishlin Comments on Summit Discussions	54
Academicians, Shishlin Discuss Disarmament	54
Paper Reviews U.S., Soviet News Conferences [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Jun]	55
Borovik Praises INF Ratification by Senate	56
Expert on 'Joint Verification Experiment'	56
Reagan Receives Petition To Extradite Murderer	56
Americans' Letter Writing to Gorbachev Lauded [PRAVDA 30 May]	57

PRAVDA Reports 30 May Summit Talks Session

*PM0106131888 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1*

[TASS report under general heading "Moscow Meeting":
"Soviet-American Talks"]

[Text] Talks took place between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in the Yekaterininskiy Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace on 30 May.

Taking part in the talks were, on the Soviet side—A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A.S. Chernyayev, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A.A. Besmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister; and Yu.V. Dubinin, USSR ambassador to the United States;

On the American side—U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz; U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci; White House Chief of Staff H. Baker; C. Powell, national security adviser to the U.S. President; P. Nitze, special ambassador and special adviser to the U.S. President and secretary of state on arms control; Ambassador E. Rowney, special adviser to the U.S. President and secretary of state on arms control; J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR; and R. Ridgway, assistant secretary of state for European and Canadian affairs.

Further Reportage on Leaders' 31 May Activities

Press Briefing Before Talks

*PM0106131688 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1*

[TASS report under general heading "Moscow Meeting":
"Answers to Journalists' Questions"]

[Text] According to the tradition that has become established at the Moscow meeting, before their next talk on 31 May M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan answered journalists' questions.

Question: Mr President, has progress been achieved on the problem of arms control on condition that the approach to SDI is preserved in the form in which it existed in December?

Answer: We have discussed SDI.

Question: Mr President, are you satisfied with the course of the discussion of this question?

Answer: Yes.

Question: And you, Mr Gorbachev?

Answer: Yesterday we had a long discussion of questions of strategic offensive arms and the whole range of arms, chemical and, particularly, conventional. We came to that conversation having already made some progress. And I think there will be more progress after that conversation. I am sure that if Mr President makes effective use of the remaining time, we will still be able to prepare that treaty.

Question: Mr President, do you think so too?

Answer: Yes, I am very pleased to hear it.

Question: So is a strategic offensive arms treaty possible?

Gorbachev's answer: If you ask me, I think it is possible.

Question: And you, Mr President, what do you think?

Answer: Yes.

Gorbachev's rejoinder: You know, the President and I have had situations where we were in a kind of impasse. And I remember a time in Geneva when the President said: "In the end, let's bang our fists on the table." I said: "Yes, let's." By morning we had agreed everything, and successfully completed Geneva. Perhaps the time is now approaching when we should bang our fists on the table again?

Question: Mr President, what do you think about that?

Answer: Yes, if it helps.

Gorbachev's rejoinder: There you are. In my opinion, we have told you more than you expected.

Question: Do you think so too, Mr President?

Answer: Perhaps.

A one-on-one meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan then took place in a study in the Kremlin.

TV Shows Luncheon With Artists

*LD3105205488 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 31 May 88*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] At midday today, President Reagan paid a visit to the Fadeyeva Central House of Writers.

There was a luncheon in the oaken hall of the Writers' House which, together with the President, was attended by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz and other U.S. guests, representatives of the creative unions of writers, cinema workers, artists, composers, and theatrical workers. They briefed the guests on the processes of restructuring and the spiritual life of Soviet society.

The President was welcomed by Zalygin, editor-in-chief of the journal NOVYY MIR; Klimov, the head of the USSR Union of Cinema Workers, and Vasnetsov, of the Union of Artists.

Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union gave a brief speech:

[Begin Karpov video recording] For the first time in history, two most powerful states—the United States and the USSR—or more accurately, the heads of these states, you Mr President, and General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, are seeking to break out of the bloody whirlpool of history and not to increase but to reduce the stockpile of arms in the name of saving civilization and the human race on earth. During the talks, both you, Mr President and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev have frequently been using proverbs. This means that you both rely on popular wisdom. Allow me, Mr President, in memory of our meeting, and for the benefit of the cause which you are undertaking over these days, to present you with a Russian proverb: A good beginning is half the work [dobroye nachalo-poloovina dela]. [Video shows Shultz and Reagan and entourage arriving at the Writers' House, entering the oaken hall—a wood panelled room in which people are seated at tables; shots of Zalygin speaking, of Klimov, and of Vasnetsov, then of Karpov speaking; among those seated in the audience is Yevtushenko, the poet. Reagan himself then proceeds to the rostrum to speak] [end recording]

[Announcer] Those assembled listened to Ronald Reagan's speech with interest:

[Begin Reagan video recording in English with interpreter's superimposed Russian translation] I have come here with a certain sense of humility. Present here are writers, artists, dramatists, and composers of this enormous country. They are the heirs of the eminent founders of the many artforms that have developed in the 20th century in Europe and the United States. I have in mind such giants as Kandinskiy, Stravinskiy, Stanislavskiy, and Dostoyevskiy. I name only a few artists whose vision transformed our whole philosophy. What I have heard now in this hall made a great impression on me. By way of my own contribution to this conversation, I would like to reply to a question that many of you—as I have been told—have been asking. It is: How is it that a former actor was able to become the leader of a great country, of

the United States? What is there in common between playing on the stage and politics—the ability to govern a state? Whatever caused the American people to entrust this lofty post to me?

You may be assured that you are not the first to ask this question. Almost every representative of the political opposition has been asking it in Washington over the past 8 years.

In the U.S. film industry, actors are frequently, as we say, typecast—that is, the film studios start to regard you as the performer of a particular kind of role. They give you only roles of the same type, and an actor can't get them to think [words indistinct]. To a certain extent it is the same in politics too.

I have had a lot of time to consider my role not only as a citizen, and one who had become a politician, but also as an actor who engaged in politics. Looking back on the past I think that my career as an actor helped me to get ready for the work I am now doing. [end recording]

[Announcer] In conclusion, the President thanked the representatives of the creative unions for the invitation and for the frank exchange of ideas and views:

[Begin Reagan video recording in English] And God bless you all. [audience applauds] [video shows Reagan speaking from rostrum] [end recording]

IZVESTIYA Reports Artists Meeting

PM0106154588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Melor Sturua report: "Conversation in the Oaken Hall. The U.S. President in the Central House of Writers"—boldface as published]

[Text] The Central House of Writers faces onto Herzen and Vorovskiy Streets. It was beneath its roof that U.S. President Ronald Reagan met representatives of the Soviet artistic intelligentsia. The meeting was held in the famous Oaken Hall.

On behalf of those present the U.S. President was welcomed by V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board. He said that all Soviet cultural figures wish the summit meeting success because this success will help strengthen the cause of peace and international security.

V. Karpov went on to say that frank speaking is one of the Oaken Hall's traditions. He expressed the hope that this meeting would proceed in line with these traditions. And so it happened. A frank conversation took place—both from the improvised rostrum, or rather pulpit, and around the tables.

S. Zalygin, chief editor of the journal NOVYY MIR, said in his speech that this was his second meeting with the President. He said that Soviet people, just like Soviet writers, have their tasks and views regarding their solution, not all of which are shared in the United States. Soviet people know more about Americans than Americans know about us. People perceive the world in two hypostases, in two trends. One is enrichment, the other is the thought that enrichment as an absolute could lead to an apocalypse. S. Zalygin said that the Soviet people are now seeking new ways to develop socialism. Say what you like about this system—it was not the system that launched two world wars, it was not the first to invent the atom bomb, and it was not the one to use it. Adopting a jocular tone, S. Zalygin remarked that the United States with its tremendous riches would find it easier to build socialism but does not want to. And that is its own business. We do not complain about it. But Americans must accept our society as an objective reality. Let us respect each other's ideals; let us respect the sacrifices made by our peoples because these sacrifices are a concentration of experience which is valuable for all mankind. There is much that divides us, but there is one goal which must unite us: the preservation of peace. S. Zalygin expressed the hope that the results of the Moscow summit meeting would prove of good service to this goal.

Among other matters, the conversation also touched on problems of cinematography. This was perfectly natural: President Reagan has behind him not only a political but also a long movie career. Mentioning this, V. Karpov gave the floor to E. Klimov, first secretary of the USSR Cinematography Workers Union Board. "As far as I know," E. Klimov said, "you, Mr President, have always been in conflict with directors. We Soviet directors have never been in conflict with actors. But we have been in conflict with other people." E. Klimov spoke without embellishment about the difficulties Soviet cinematography had to endure during the periods of personality cult and stagnation, about the way these difficulties are now being overcome, about the fact that some 100 movies which had been gathering dust on the shelf for a long time have now been brought back to life. This work continues to this day. It testifies to the tremendous viability of Soviet cinematography and its tremendous creative potential. By way of illustration, E. Klimov cited the following data: Works by Soviet cinematography workers have won 64 major prizes at 37 international festivals. Ties between Soviet and U.S. moviemakers have been stepped up. The "celluloid curtain," just like the "iron curtain," must be eliminated.

A. Vasnetsov, chairman of the USSR Artists Union Board, talked about the universality of the language of art: a language which speaks of peace and goodness. He expressed the hope that the Moscow summit would promote the expansion and deepening of contacts between Soviet and U.S. cultural figures. This is all the more important as we know little about contemporary American artists, he said. And you know even less about

our contemporary artists. There is a saying that when guns talk, the muses fall silent. A. Vasnetsov called for another rule to prevail in the world: Let the muses talk at the top of their voices and the guns fall silent.

V. Karpov gave the floor to U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The President started his speech with a joke: "As King Henry of England said to his sixth wife, I won't keep you long...." However, the President then turned to serious matters. He paid tribute to Russia's great contribution to the treasure house of world culture, citing the works of Dostoyevskiy, Stanislavskiy, Stravinskii, and Kandinskii as examples. I am often asked, he said, how I, an actor, could become a politician and President of the United States. Can an actor be trusted? What do acting on the theatrical and political stages have in common? Developing this theme, the President said that his career as an actor had largely promoted his political career, since he had learned two lessons from it—and both these lessons were taught him by outstanding figures in Soviet culture. The first lesson was the precept of the great film director Sergey Eyzenshteyn that it is necessary to have vision, to assimilate and preserve it, and to register and retain it in the memory. The President said that his meetings with M.S. Gorbachev had convinced him that the Soviet leader has this vision. The second lesson, Reagan continued, he learned from Anna Akhmatova's "Requiem." This lesson consists in the ability to reconstruct the image of man. This ability is equally necessary in poetry, the theater, and politics.

President Reagan devoted a considerable part of his speech to the problem of freedom of creativity and freedom of speech. Talking about the universal nature of freedom, Reagan said that the more freedom there is in the Soviet Union, the more freedom there will be in the United States; and that the more freedom there is in our countries, the more there will be in other countries, too.

The meeting ended. The lofty guest left the Central House of Writers. The conversation between the U.S. President and the Soviet cultural figures had passed in a frank but good-natured [blagozhelatelnyy] atmosphere. We can hope that as a result of the meeting, both sides have gained more accurate knowledge about each other, and if they have abandoned anything, it is only certain long-grating stereotypes. Let us hope that this is so!

University Speech Reported

LD0106013288 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1917 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 31 May (TASS)—The visit by U.S. President R. Reagan today to Moscow State University in the Lenin Hills continued the long tradition of meetings between the students and lecturers of this major Soviet higher educational establishment with state and public figures from various countries.

Welcoming the guest in the university's assembly hall, A.A. Logunov, rector of Moscow State University, stressed the importance of the further development of scientific and humanitarian contacts between the USSR and the United States and expressed the conviction that the young people of both countries should know and understand each other better.

Before leaving Washington, said Ronald Reagan, I received numerous deeply felt letters and telegrams containing the request for me during my stay here to express one simple thought. Maybe this is a simple thought, but it represents one of the most important points on the agenda of the present summit—it is the thought of peace, good will, and hope for the strengthening of the friendship and the closeness of our peoples.

As you know, I have come to Moscow in order to meet with one of the more prominent graduates of your educational establishment. During the current, fourth, summit, the general secretary and I have spent many hours together and I think that we are starting to get to know each other better.

Of course, at the center of our talks have been numerous important problems of the present age. But to start with I would like to talk with you just as I would talk with any group of students of a U.S. university, not just about the realities of the present day, but also about the opportunities of tomorrow.

The U.S. President noted the enormous significance of the scientific-technological revolution. Just as a cocoon develops we are passing from the economy of the industrial revolution—an economy bound and limited by the physical resources of the earth—toward an "economy of reason" in which there are no limits to the human imagination, and freedom of creativity becomes the most valuable kind of natural resource.

Just think about the tiny computer chip. Its value is not in the sand out of which it was created, but in its microscopic construction, developed thanks to the inventiveness of the human intellect. Or take, for example, the satellite with the help of which the reportage on our meeting is being relayed to the whole world. It uses thousands of tonnes of copper that have been extracted from the depths of the earth and transformed into wire.

The inventors of the present epoch are enterprising people, dreamers who possess the courage to subject themselves to danger and with enough faith to encounter the unknown. They are the basic motivating force of the technological revolution.

The U.S. President went on to deal in detail with the course of development of the world economy and the U.S. political system, interrelationships between authority and the individual. You understand, he said, that I am constantly returning to this not simply in order to praise the virtues of my country, but also in order to talk

about the genuine greatness of heart and soul of your land. It is surely unnecessary to talk in the land of Dostoyevskiy about a search for truth, in the homeland of Kandinskiy and Skryabin about the imagination, in the land of the rich and noble culture of Uzbek poet Alisher Navoi about beauty and sincerity. The great culture of your multiform country addresses itself ardently and passionately to all mankind.

Today the whole world is waiting with hope for signs of changes, steps on the road to more freedom in the Soviet Union. We are watching and hoping when we see positive changes taking place.

But changes do not have to mean a rejection of the past. Like a tree growing vigorously at all times of the year, which has put down roots into the earth and taking life from the sun, positive changes also have to put down roots in the traditional values and ideals—the land and culture and the family.

It is just such a future that is beckoning your generation. It is time to get rid of the barriers dividing people.

I propose to expand the student exchange program between our countries. On Monday General Secretary Gorbachev recalled a fine Russian proverb, which is very suitable for this instance: "Better to see once than hear a hundred times". Mr Gorbachev and I first started working on this in 1985; during our talk today we agreed to bring the number of exchanges in the near future to several thousand people from each country. We would be immensely glad if the Soviet people could get to know us better and better understand our way of life.

Only a few years ago few people could have imagined the progress achieved together by our two countries—the INF Treaty which General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed in last December in Washington is the first treaty on a genuine reduction of nuclear weapons in history, providing for the elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear missiles. Only 16 days ago we saw the start of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

I earnestly hope that we will be able to continue our constructive cooperation on these problems and review the continuing destructive conflicts in many parts of the world, and that the serious discussions that led to the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan will aid in the adoption of decisions in other regions. Peace between peoples must be the lasting aim, and not a tactical stage in a ceaseless conflict.

I have been told that there is a popular song in your country, in which the chorus consists of a question: "Do the Russians want war?"

But what about your former allies? What about those whom you once embraced on the Elbe? What if we were to ask their mothers, sisters, and sons: Do the Americans want war? Ask us as well, and you will hear the same answer, the same passionate desire in every heart.

I can say that in my life it would be the greatest happiness if U.S. and Soviet diplomats worked together on the problem of commercial contacts between the United States and the growing, vigorous Soviet Union, an exporter that can create possibilities for economic freedom and growth. I would be overjoyed if I could live to see the day when an impresario, say in Britain, could invite a Soviet rock group without resorting to the services of government agencies, and if they could play in Liverpool the night after.

Is that just a dream? Maybe. But it is a dream that we must realize.

Your generation is living through one of the most exciting, encouraging periods in Soviet history. It is a time when one feels in the air the breath of freedom and the heart is beating with a faster rhythm of hope, when the accumulated spiritual energy is striving to burst to the surface. In this connection R. Reagan quoted an excerpt from "Dead Souls" in which N.V. Gogol compared his country with a fast troika.

In conclusion, the U.S. President expressed the hope that the fine sounds of general openness [otkrytosti] will lead humanity to a new world—a world of reconciliation and friendship.

Then R. Reagan replied to students' questions. In particular, a history student asked whether the President regarded it as important for himself to achieve new concrete accords with the Soviet leadership on a mutual reduction of arms.

Replying to this question, R. Reagan noted the complexity of talks on this area, however, he said, both Mr Gorbachev and I hope to complete work on this treaty before I leave my post.

One student expressed bewilderment that the U.S. President gave part of his very precious time in Moscow to a conversation with so-called "dissidents". All the more, the youth said with indignation, since among their number was a former fascist toady—a polizei. No direct answer to this question was forthcoming.

A female biology student brought the attention of the boss of the White House to the grave position of the American Indians, about which representatives of the native population of the continent, who have come to Moscow, had told the world public.

The U.S. President stated in response that this situation is the result of the desire of the U.S. authorities "to help the Indians preserve their way of life." Maybe this is a mistaken approach, he added.

The students and teachers of Moscow State University thanked R. Reagan for their meeting with him.

TV Reports University Speech

LD3106232488 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 31 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] U.S. President Ronald Reagan today visited the Lomonosov Moscow State University. Students, professors, and lecturers gathered in the university's assembly hall to meet the President. Academician Logunov, the university's rector, made a speech of welcome to the President. Subsequently, President Ronald Reagan made a speech.

He wished the students success in passing the coming semester's examinations and wished success to the university's body of professors and lecturers. Prior to my departure from Washington, Ronald Reagan said, I received a large number of letters and cables containing requests to convey to all of you, Soviet people, the simplest of wishes: namely, wishes of peace and good will, for expanding the friendship between our two peoples and their rapprochement.

Touching on the talks he is having with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, Ronald Reagan said he thought we are beginning to get to know each other. In his speech, the President dwelt in detail on the technological revolution now taking place in the world. He noted that this revolution is radically changing the world in which we now live, giving life new dimensions. From the material existence, we make our breakthrough into a world in which man himself forms his destiny.

However, while researching into the most advanced reaches of sciences, the President said, we are at the same time returning to the age-old truths of our civilization. The President said progress is not predetermined and that freedom is the key to it: freedom of thought, freedom of information, freedom of contacts. Ronald Reagan touched on the subject of changes that are now taking place in the USSR. He said that in his conversations with the general secretary, he had spoken of the great importance of making these changes permanent. The President expressed the wish that direct contacts between the Soviet and American peoples should expand.

Peace among states should be an invariable goal of all countries, said Ronald Reagan. In conclusion, the President expressed the hope that a new world will triumph—a world of reconciliation and friendship.

President Reagan then replied to questions. He was presented with a souvenir from the university's collective.

TV Reports Answers to Students

LD0106233788 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0230 GMT 1 Jun 88

[From the "120 Minutes" program; President Reagan's replies to Moscow University students; President Reagan answers in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Student Shorozhkin] Shorozhkin, Igor, Journalism Faculty. Esteemed Mr President, I am very concerned about the fate of the 310 Soviet troops who have disappeared without trace in Afghanistan. Could you not, and would you like to, do what you can to help to find them and bring them back home?

[Reagan] Very much so. We would be very pleased to assist in this.

[Student Averan] Averan, Dmitriy, student of the Faculty of Jurisprudence. Mr President, the implementation by civilians of inalienable rights places before the administration in your country a serious problem. These include such rights as the rights of citizens to bear arms and the dissemination of pornography and drugs. Do you think this is the inevitable cost of democracy, an inalienable part of democracy, and an unavoidable evil or can one fight this evil?

[Reagan] Well, if I understand the question correctly, the question concerns inalienable rights. So does this mean the right for a person to live a life of crime and take drugs, and so on, is that it? The answer is no. We have a set of laws.

[Student, name indistinct] Journalism Faculty. Mr President, from history I know that people connected with great power and major offices relinquish power with great difficulty. [laughter in hall] In connection with your forthcoming retirement, what are your feelings now, and if you had the chance would you stay for another term? [more laughter and applause]

[Reagan] It has become a tradition in our country that the President serve only two terms. This dates back to the first president, Washington. This was only because during the creation of our state, there was a lot of talk about the possibility of turning America into a monarchy, and we had just (won our liberty). So, after his second term, Washington stood down and said that he was doing so to prevent a trend toward the idea of a legacy of aristocracy. Many succeeding presidents did not have the opportunity to run for a second term, but this tradition has remained, just the tradition. Roosevelt ran four times and he died at the beginning of the fourth one, and in that atmosphere an amendment was made to the Constitution that the president has the right to

occupy his office for just two terms. When I leave office—I cannot do this at the moment because I think I would take such steps for myself. [sentence as heard]

I intend to speak at luncheons and dinners and I will try to convince the people of our country that this amendment to the Constitution should be removed because it is an obstacle to the right of the people. The people should have the right to vote for someone as many times as they like. So it is they who are losing the right. But, you see, I will no longer be President then, so I can do that, and I can act like that. I will try to do something more to try to convince Congress regarding what should be done. I have always said that if in Hollywood, when I was there, if you couldn't sing or dance, then all that was left was to make speeches. I couldn't do one or the other, so I maintain that my destiny to make speeches shows how much I failed to achieve, but I call upon Congress to achieve this. What will my feelings be when I cease to be President? I couldn't imagine, after 8 years as governor, that a few days later when someone invited Nancy and me out to dinner (?we waited) [words indistinct]. [video shows President speaking and close-ups of students asking questions from the floor]

[Announcer] The U.S. President replied to other questions from students. A souvenir gift was presented to him from the collective of the university.

Further on Reagan, Students

PM0106160388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[S. Dardykin, G. Charodeyev report: "Moscow State University Is Asking Questions. Reportage from R. Reagan's Meeting with Students"]

[Text] "I have come to Moscow in order to continue talks with one of the outstanding graduates from your university." This is how U.S. President Ronald Reagan opened his speech to Moscow State University students. The president's arrival coincided with an examination session, and he wished those present in the auditorium success in their examinations for which he was rewarded with friendly applause.

In his lengthy speech, R. Reagan said many things which could not but meet with response from his audience. For instance, he recalled the song "Do the Russians Want War?" and expressed confidence that many of those present have heard it. He even quoted a whole stanza. "And what about your former allies?" the President asked. "What about those who met you on the Elbe? What if you asked their ocean and sea graves, or the European battlefields where Americans are buried far away from home? What if you asked their mothers, sisters, or sons whether the Americans want war? If you ask us, you will get to hear the same answer, the same yearnings in every soul. Peoples do not wage wars. Wars are waged by governments...."

A large part of his speech was devoted to extolling the advantages of the American way of life. After the President's speech, as planned, students were able to address questions to the President.

The first to raise his hand was a student from the history department (we apologize to readers, but it was impossible to catch all the names):

"Is it important for you as President, as a politician, and as a human being to achieve new specific arms reduction agreements before the end of the current year?"

The President's reply: "The treaty on strategic offensive arms which is currently being elaborated is much more complex than the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which has just been ratified. Much remains to be settled. Our negotiators are working in Geneva. We hope that it will be possible to complete this work before I leave my post as President in January 1989. However, I assure you that if it is not completed by then, I will impress on my successor that the treaty must be signed. We have embarked on this path, and it is possible to hope that one day there will be no more nuclear weapons on earth."

The next question: "You have told us, Mr President, that the efforts aimed at ending regional conflicts will be continued. On what regions of the world should these efforts concentrate?"

The President cited southern Africa as an example. According to him, the main obstacle to the solution of all problems, including the granting of independence to Namibia, is the presence of Cubans in Angola. So there are no more obstacles.

Another question:

"Mr President, since yesterday I have very much wanted to know why you invited a former member of the Nazi police to the reception at your residence. And I would also like to hear your impression of the meeting with the refuseniks."

There was a flicker of embarrassment when the first part of the question was translated for the President:

"For some reason, I did not know about that. Maybe the information is wrong...."

The President added that the names that appeared on the list had been communicated to him personally by aides, relatives, or friends.

To smooth over the gaffe, R. Reagan recalled one of the people invited to the meeting at the President's residence the day before. We realized he was talking about A. Stolyar, who was given permission to emigrate to the United States some years ago but who is refusing to

obtain a visa. The reason is that his son's wife's mother objects to her daughter's leaving the country. "They are one family, and they do not want to leave without her," the President explained.

The questions at the Moscow State University meeting were being asked by the students, so we journalists were unable to ask whether the Soviet authorities, in the President's opinion, had to forcibly dispatch all A. Stolyar's relatives abroad for the U.S. side to drop the matter. It seems that that is the U.S. idea of freedom to leave.

The questioner was Igor Shorozhkin, student in the department of journalism:

"I am worried about the fate of the 310 Soviet soldiers missing in Afghanistan. Would the United States be able to give assistance in searching for them and returning them home?"

"Of course, we would be very happy to give assistance...."

A biology student came to the microphone:

"I heard that the American Indians who have come to Moscow were unable to get a meeting with you. What prevented a meeting from taking place?"

"I didn't know they wanted to meet with me. Did they come here? Well, I would be very happy to see them.... I will tell you about the American Indians. We once gave them millions of hectares of land in reservations. All along they have told the authorities that they want to preserve their way of life on the prairies. We did everything to meet their wishes.... Many of them are rich. There is a lot of oil on the territory of the reservations. And oil can make you rich. I don't know what they have to complain about...."

The 15 minutes allowed by the rules of the meeting for questions and answers had run out. The President said goodbye. Moscow State University Rector Academician A. Logunov presented a box with a panorama of the Moscow State University on its lid as a souvenir of the visit to the university.

Students Comment on Meeting

PM0206122988 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 88 p 3

[Special correspondents Ye. Ovcharenko and R. Guseynov report: "The President at Moscow State University"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Welcoming the guest to the university's assembly hall, Academician A.A. Logunov, rector of Moscow State University, stressed the importance of further developing the scientific and humanitarian contacts between the USSR and the United States and expressed the conviction that young people in both countries should learn to know and understand each other better.

"As you know, I have come to Moscow to meet with one of the most distinguished graduates of your educational establishment," President R. Reagan said. "In this, the fourth summit, General Secretary Gorbachev and I have spent many hours together and I believe that we're getting to know each other better.

"I want to talk to you not just of the realities of today but of the possibilities of tomorrow," he stressed. The White House incumbent dwelt on the issues of the scientific and technical revolution, stressing that progress is always based on freedom: Freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly.

"Today the entire world is hopefully watching the signs of change and the steps toward greater freedom in the Soviet Union. We are following them and are imbued with confidence as positive changes take place," R. Reagan stressed. He dwelt on the milestones marking the last 3 years—the INF Treaty, the beginning of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan—and noted that there is hope of progress in resolving regional conflicts given constructive cooperation between our two countries.

"I've been told," R. Reagan said, "that there's a popular song in your country whose refrain asks the question: 'Do the Russians want a war?'"

"But what of your one-time allies? What of those with whom you once embraced on the Elbe? What if we were to ask their mothers, sisters, and sons: Do Americans want war? Ask us too and you'll find the same answer, the same impassioned desire in every heart."

Then the questions started, questions that were youthfully direct and humanely sincere—the certain philosophical abstractness present in the emotional and rich speech had aroused a desire among the young audience for businesslike specifics. For instance, why, Mr. President, did you invite a polizei [police officer recruited from among local population by German occupying forces] and traitor to a meeting in Spaso House? If the settlement in Afghanistan proves effective, why not immediately switch to efforts to resolve other decisive conflicts? Will you be meeting with the American Indian representatives who have come to Moscow to draw attention to their people's tragic situation?

The last questions were asked, Reagan gave his answers—which, it should be noted, were always quick and often witty and amicable—then one of the President's security men removed the U.S. emblem from the presidential rostrum, neatly packing it away in a plastic bag.

"Has my attitude to the U.S. President changed after today's meeting?" Igor Zaytsev, a student at the Moscow State University Physics Faculty, repeated the question.

"Probably not. I know he's pretty good at putting forward views that have been tried and approved by numerous audiences. I was interested to hear firsthand from the President on how he views our society and Soviet people."

"Would you like to visit the United States yourself, Igor?"

"I already have. I was lucky enough to spend a semester at the University of Maryland while my American counterparts were spending a semester at Moscow State University. Our trip was one of the results of the Geneva summit between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan. I highly value the time spent in the United States, not only from a professional viewpoint, but also as a period when I was able to tell young Americans a great deal about my country and understand a lot about America.

"It seems to me that, in saying a great deal about democracy, the President is trying to fashion democracy in all countries in the U.S. image. Something along the lines of 'little Americas.' He interprets democracy in a very particular way and, judging by everything, simply does not accept other viewpoints."

"How does someone who has just asked the President a question feel?" We put this question to Dan Unguryan, a student at the Moscow State University History Faculty, literally dragging him out of a crowd of American colleagues. The young man caught his breath and anxiously and obstinately countered: "It would be better to ask how I feel on the eve of my finals—and although President Reagan wished us success at the session, I'm afraid the examining commission will make no allowances."

"Did I learn anything new?" Dan repeated the question. "The President, as usual, praised American values—we have heard that before more than once. Of course, it was nice to hear Russian culture complimented with references to Gogol, Navoi, and Dostoyevskiy. Probably the novelty and usefulness of the meeting was in the very spirit of the speech. Even the pure U.S. propaganda slogans sounded calmer, with no pressure. It seems to me that until recently the U.S. President spoke in a more peremptory tone and literally imposed U.S. positions on the world. Now we have heard the voice of a politician able to respect a different opinion, the leader of a country participating in dialogue. This is very important!"

Right alongside us the President's speech was being discussed by a group of young men and women. One of them said heatedly: "What does 'reservations were created for the Indians to allow them to preserve their own culture' mean? And the President also said that many Indians had been made rich by oil. These are just words—after all, the Indians even petitioned the UN Commission on Human Rights!"

It is good that the U.S. leader found time to meet with young people—that has great meaning. The young men and women sitting in the hall can quite rightly be called the generation of change. It will be their job to continue tomorrow the dialogue under way in Moscow today.

TV Reports Gorbachev, Yakovlev Walk

LD3105233488 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 31 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Following the signing of the Soviet-U.S. documents, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev had another unscheduled meeting with Muscovites and visitors to the capital. [video shows Gorbachev, with Yakovlev behind, talking to crowd of people in open area]

[Gorbachev] And what's (?all this, then)? And where are you from?

[Voice in English] USA. California.

[Gorbachev] Oh! [laughs and turns to another group]

[American voice from the crowd] Mr Gorbachev, we hope that you (?thought) there would be a fifth summit; things seem to be going well. Could there be a fifth Reagan-Gorbachev summit?

[Yakovlev, interpreting for Gorbachev] Will there be a fifth summit—Gorbachev-Reagan?

[Gorbachev] I always acknowledge the possibility of holding such a meeting if there is progress, and progress is possible. It is always possible. But it will depend not only on us, not only on us.

[American questioner] What's the most important thing that has happened so far, Mr General Secretary?

[Gorbachev] The main thing is there has been an intensive political dialogue on all problems. The dialogue has been at a high level of frankness and depth, I would say, of openness [otkrytost], too.

[American questioner] Do you think there can be a framework—at least a framework—for reducing long-range missiles, or is that too much to ask this trip?

[Yakovlev, interpreting this question in Russian] What do you think? Is some sort of framework possible for an agreement on strategic armaments? [Yakovlev laughs]

[Gorbachev] At the moment several groups of people are at work over there [gestures with hand] and what's more they are working both day and night. The President and I are all the time a part of this process. How it will end we

will soon know. If you wait you will find out. We have now come up against a number of specific issues—very important issues—and it is not easy to find a solution to them right away.

[Yakovlev, in English] Now we see many, many very serious questions, and it is not very easy to find the decisions. I'm not an interpreter, I'm sorry!

[Gorbachev, turning away from Yakovlev and addressing another group in the crowd, smiling] Thank you, thank you! [shaking hands with man heard saying "Greetings from Italy" in English] Where are you from? Rome? Venice? Milan? Turin?

[Man in crowd, now visible] Brescia [word indistinct] Milano.

[Gorbachev] Milan?

[Man] Milano, Brescia, Brescia. I too am Mikhail. [points to himself and then to Gorbachev to indicate that both have the same first name which amuses Gorbachev]

Guest List at 31 May Dinner

PM0106152688 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under general heading "For a Reliable and Secure Peace"]

[Text] A dinner was given on behalf of U.S. President R. Reagan and N. Reagan at the U.S. ambassador's residence in Moscow on 31 May, in honor of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and R.M. Gorbacheva.

Present at the dinner were, on the Soviet side, M.S. Gorbachev and his wife, A.A. Gromyko and his wife, N.I. Ryzhkov and his wife, L.N. Zaykov and his wife, Ye.K. Ligachev, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, Yu.D. Maslyukov, G.P. Razumovskiy, D.T. Yazov, and A.F. Dobrynin, leaders of a number of ministries and departments, military leaders, prominent figures in science, culture, and art, and well known sportsmen.

Among those invited to the dinner were U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz and other officials accompanying the President on his trip, representatives of U.S. business circles, and senior diplomatic staffers of the American Embassy.

TASS Rounds Up Third Day

LD3105221288 Moscow TASS in English 2118 GMT
31 May 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—The third day of the official visit by U.S. President Ronald Reagan to the Soviet Union has ended. It was rich in important meetings, talks of great significance both for bilateral relations and for the situation in the world on the whole.

The day started with a conversation between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President at Mikhail Gorbachev's study in the Kremlin.

New, important steps towards strengthening Soviet-U.S. relations were made today. The high-ranking representatives of the two governments signed a number of bilateral documents, which consolidated what has been achieved in Soviet-American cooperation. The documents cover a wide range of issues, including an agreement between the Soviet Union and USA on notification of launches of submarine-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles. A programme on cooperation and exchanges for 1989-1991 was signed. The sides agreed to create a single radionavigation system, signed an agreement on cooperation in maritime search and rescue.

The President had an opportunity today to meet with the representatives of various circles of the Soviet public. He was warmly welcomed by the creative intelligentsia at the Central House of Writers. In the afternoon students at Moscow State University played host to Ronald Reagan.

Other officials on the delegation also had a busy schedule today. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz held a substantive discussion of a wide range of issues on Soviet-U.S. relationships. Another conversation between the heads of the military departments of the two states, Dmitriy Yazov and Frank Carlucci, took place.

On the third day of her stay in the Soviet Union Nancy Reagan, the wife of the President, visited Leningrad, one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Accompanied by Lidiya Gromyko, the wife of the president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, she reviewed the priceless collections at the Hermitage, went to Petrodvorets. In the second half of the day Nancy Reagan returned to Moscow.

In the evening Ronald Reagan and his wife gave a dinner in honour of Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbachev at Spaso House.

Reagan's Activities Reviewed

PM0106150088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Jun 88 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by G. Vasilyev, N. Kurdyumov, and A. Maslennikov: "In a Businesslike Tone"]

[Text] The 3d day of the Soviet-American summit meeting was packed with diverse activity. It included the next one-on-one talk between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, participation in the signing of Soviet-American documents, the U.S. President's meeting with representatives of the Soviet creative intelligentsia, and his visit to Moscow State University.

The leaders of the two countries' foreign policy departments also continued their work, discussing a wide range of issues in the sphere of USSR-U.S. relations. The two countries' defense ministers held another working meeting.

The Soviet-American summit talks have taken on a steady pace. If a motto was needed for the 3d day of the meeting, it could be formulated thus: to know each other better, to cooperate with each other more, in the interests of the two countries and in the interests of mankind—because yesterday, questions of bilateral relations were at the center of the attention of the participants in the summit meeting. At the U.S. President's request, M.S. Gorbachev spoke about the restructuring that is taking place in our country and stressed that its aim is to widen democracy and to strengthen the socialist system.

Trade, cultural exchanges, scientific contacts—these are the living fabric of day-to-day collaboration between peoples. It can be noted with satisfaction that the general improvement in Soviet-American relations is having a very positive effect on our bilateral relations.

The signing of the Soviet-American documents in the Red Drawing Room of the Great Kremlin Palace yesterday morning indicates that long before its end, the meeting has been marked with concrete results. First, let us mention the agreement between the USSR and the United States on the conduct of a joint experiment in verification of nuclear explosions and the agreement on notification of launches of ICBM's and SLBM's. These are among the accords designed to limit the arms race and promote disarmament. The other documents cover cultural exchanges, the creation of a joint radionavigation system, rescuing people at sea, and cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space and in the transport sphere. In a word—"on land, in the skies, and at sea."

Our age illuminates anew the significance of various types of human activity. The role of writers, artists, movie makers, and musicians, who mold the spiritual world and thus man's conduct, has increased particularly markedly. The American President's meeting with Soviet cultural personalities, held yesterday at the Central House of Writers, took the form of a lively, interesting dialogue. Ideas on life, on what divides us from the Americans and what unites us, were put forward by writers Vladimir Karpov and Sergey Zalygin, movie director Elem Klimov, and artist Andrey Vasnetsov.

In his speech, Reagan described how his work as an actor helped him to become President: Acting and politics, he said, have much in common. In the President's opinion, "an artist like a politician, has to take into account the enormous diversity of mankind." The President spoke in a positive tone of the "thaw" in Soviet cultural life.

The visit by U.S. President R. Reagan to Moscow State University in the Lenin Hills on 31 May continued the ancient tradition of meetings between students and teachers from the great Soviet VUZ with state and public figures from various countries.

Before leaving Washington, R. Reagan said, I received a great many heartfelt letters and telegrams asking me, during my stay here, to express one simple idea. Perhaps this idea is simple, but it is one of the most important items on the agenda at the present summit meeting—it is the idea of peace, goodwill, and the hope of strengthening the friendship and intimacy between our peoples. As you know, I have come to Moscow in order to meet with one of the most outstanding graduates of your academic institution. At this fourth summit meeting, General Secretary Gorbachev and I have spent many hours together, and I think we are beginning to get to know each other better.

Of course, a great many important problems of today are at the center of our talks. But first I would like to talk with you just as I would talk with any group of university students in the United States, not only about the realities of today but also about the possibilities for tomorrow.

The U.S. President noted the tremendous significance of the scientific and technical revolution. Like a developing cocoon, he said, we are changing from the economy of the industrial revolution—an economy based on and limited by the earth's physical resources—to the "economy of reason," in which human imagination knows no bounds and freedom of creativity becomes the most valuable type of natural resources.

The U.S. President then dwelt in detail on the course of development of the world economy, the U.S. political system, and the relationship between power and people. You understand, he said, that I keep coming back to this not simply in order to extol my country's virtues, but also in order to speak of the true greatness of heart and soul of your land. There is no need, in the land of Dostoyevskiy, to speak of the quest for truth, in the land of Kandinskiy and Skryabin to speak of imagination, in the land of the rich and noble culture of the Uzbek poet Alisher Navoi to speak of beauty and sincerity. The great culture of your diverse country appeals warmly and passionately to all mankind.

Today the whole world hopefully awaits signs of changes, steps along the path to greater freedom in the Soviet Union. We are looking on, and we are hopeful, when we see the positive changes that are taking place.

I propose extending the program for exchanges of school-children between our countries. On Monday General Secretary Gorbachev mentioned a fine Russian proverb which is very appropriate to this occasion: "It is better to see once than to hear 100 times." Mr Gorbachev and I first began working on this in 1985; during our conversation today, we agreed to increase the number of

exchanges to several thousand people from each country in the near future. We would be extremely glad if the Soviet people could get to know us better and understand our way of life better.

Only a few years ago, Reagan went on, few people could have imagined the progress that our two countries have achieved together: The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed last December in Washington, is the first treaty on real nuclear arms reduction in history and provides for the elimination of an entire class of American and Soviet nuclear missiles. Only 16 days ago, we saw the start of the withdrawal of your troops from Afghanistan.

I ardently hope that we will be able to continue our constructive cooperation on these problems and to examine the continuing destructive conflicts in many regions of the world, and that the serious discussions that led to the Geneva agreements in Afghanistan will promote the adoption of decisions in other regions. Peace between peoples should be a long-term goal, not a tactical stage in a continuing conflict.

I was told that there is a popular song in your country—its refrain consists of the question: "Do the Russians want war?"

But what about your former allies? What about those whom you once embraced on the Elbe? What if we asked their mothers, sisters, and sons: Do the Americans want war? Ask us too, and you will hear the same reply, one passionate desire in every heart.

Your generation lives in one of the most exciting, encouraging periods in Soviet history. It is a time when you can feel the breath of freedom in the air and hearts beat with an accelerated rhythm of hope, when the accumulated spiritual energy is surging forth. In this connection R. Reagan quoted a passage from "Dead Souls" in which N.V. Gogol likened his country to a fast troika.

In conclusion the U.S. President expressed the hope that the fine sounds of general openness will lead mankind toward a new world—a world of reconciliation and friendship.

R. Reagan then answered the students' questions. In particular, a history student asked whether the President considers it important for him to achieve concrete new accords with the Soviet leadership on mutual arms reduction.

Answering this question, R. Reagan noted the complexity of talks in this area, but, he said, Mr Gorbachev and I both hope to complete work on this treaty before I leave my post.

One of the students expressed perplexity at the fact that the U.S. President devoted part of his precious time in Moscow to a talk with so-called "dissidents." Especially, the youth said with indignation, since there was a former henchman of the fascists—the Polizei—among them. This question received no direct answer.

At the joint briefing for journalists that was held at the Soviet-American meeting's press center in the evening, journalists were informed that questions of our countries' economic cooperation were also touched on in yesterday's talks. A large group of major American businessmen visited our country recently, but their desire to trade and cooperate is meeting obstacles, for instance, the refusal to grant the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status. The emigration rules in force in the USSR are cited by way of justification. Obviously, this practice can benefit nobody. What if the Soviet Union also started imposing restrictions on trade with the United States, citing Washington's policy on immigrants from Mexico?

Describing the atmosphere in which the American President's visit to Moscow is taking place, M. Fitzwater, the White House press spokesman, stated that Reagan is greatly impressed by the reception accorded him by Soviet people. The President, Fitzwater said, is very satisfied with how the meeting is going. All the talks held have been very businesslike. The usual polemics was absent, which gives us hope for success at the discussions taking place.

Incidentally, when one American correspondent again asked the President what is becoming a hackneyed question, i.e. how do his present impressions compare with his former statements about the Soviet Union as the "evil empire," the President replied: "I was speaking of another time, another era."

And so, the visit goes on.

Reagan Activities, Meetings of 1 Jun Reported

'Final Meeting' Begins

LD0106061188 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0600 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jun (TASS)—At this moment, the final meeting is beginning between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the American President, Ronald Reagan, who is in our country on an official visit. Soviet-U.S. documents will be signed, and a news conference by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan is planned for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Reagan, Gorbachev Brief Press

LD0106083288 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0725 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Special newscast: "On the Visit to the USSR by U.S. President R. Reagan"]

[Text] Soviet-U.S. talks continued in the Kremlin today. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a warm welcome to U.S. President Ronald Reagan. In accordance with the good tradition of the Moscow meeting, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan answered questions from journalists before starting their discussions. The newsmen were especially interested in knowing when an agreement on strategic offensive weapons will be signed. [video shows Gorbachev followed by interpreter and Gromyko walking into room; Reagan and Shultz approach from the other end with their interpreters; Reagan and Gorbachev shake hands, smile, and chat; Shultz, Reagan, Gorbachev, and Gromyko are then shown standing in line behind a table answering questions from journalists]

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Comrade General Secretary, when will the treaty on strategic offensive weapons be signed?

[Gorbachev] I think what has been done and will be done during this time—and our work is still going on—I think that this, at any rate, allows me to confirm what I have said: There is still a possibility of reaching a treaty under the current administration.

[Correspondent] Mr President, what is your opinion?

[Reagan—in English] We are in agreement. [end recording]

The U.S. President said he agreed with this opinion.

Then journalists asked if there had been any surprises at the talks.

[Begin recording] [Reagan—in English] Any surprises?

[Gorbachev] By and large, the President and I are in favor of having more predictability in our relations.

[Interpreter—in English] The President and I are in favor of greater predictability in our relations.

[Unidentified correspondent—in English] Mr President, what's your reaction been so far? What do you think of the meeting so far? [end recording]

Ronald Reagan was asked how he thought the talks were going.

[Begin recording] [Reagan—in English] I think they've been fine. [Words indistinct] been getting along very well. [end recording]

Everything is fine. The talks are going well. Today is the final round of Soviet-U.S. talks. Questions of disarmament and of ridding mankind of the burden of nuclear missiles are at the center of the discussions.

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] It was a spontaneous handshake in Geneva. Remember, it was recorded. [end recording]

Further on Briefing

LD0106090688 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT
1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan had their final meeting in the [words indistinct] of the Grand Kremlin Palace today.

As they posed for photographers before it, the two leaders fielded questions from reporters.

Asked when a START (Strategic Arms Reduction Talks) treaty would be signed, Gorbachev said: "I think everything that will have been done these days—and the work is still going on—makes it possible for me to confirm what I have already said, namely that there's still a possibility to bring about the treaty before this administration leaves office."

Asked if he agreed, Reagan said he did.

Reporters then wanted to know if any surprises, anything unexpected concerning START or SDI, something reporters weren't aware of, could be expected today.

Gorbachev replied: "The President and I are for greater predictability in our relationship."

Reagan, responding to a question about his opinion on the progress of the talks, said that they had been going well, that the two leaders had been getting along well and that he was satisfied with the tone of the negotiations.

When asked if there had been any real progress on SDI, as hoped for, the U.S. President remarked they had said from the very beginning that that was a complex sphere and the question was hard to answer. He explained they were continuing to work on it.

He answered in the affirmative when asked whether there were now fewer problems than before the summit.

Asked if it had proved possible to solve any major problems, he said all the problems were major. To the question of whether there had been any understanding on SDI or anything close to an accord, he said that there had been "no big breakthrough", but they kept working towards it.

Gorbachev said: "Keep the rest of the questions for the press conferences. They are going to take place before long."

But a reporter still asked him another question, namely if European problems would be discussed. Gorbachev replied: "We'll be discussing this issue now as well. It's in the focus of attention."

Delegation Members Listed

LD0106151988 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT
1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan today held their final meeting in the Kremlin.

They concluded the discussion of a wide range of matters related to disarmament, regional conflicts and bilateral relations, and humanitarian issues.

The sides summed up the results of the Soviet-American talks.

Participating in the talks were:

On the Soviet side—Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau and Foreign Minister, Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Dmitriy Yazov, alternate member of the Political Bureau and defence minister, Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Anatoliy Chernyayev, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy foreign minister, and Yuriy Dubinin, Soviet ambassador to the United States.

On the U.S. side—Secretary of State George Shultz, Defence Secretary Frank Carlucci, Howard Baker, chief of staff to the President, Colin Powell, assistant to the president for national security affairs, Paul Nitze, ambassador at large and special adviser to the President and the secretary of state for arms control, Edward Rowny, special adviser to the President and the secretary of state for arms control, Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, and Rozanne Ridgway, assistant secretary of state for European and Canadian affairs.

Ratification Instruments Exchanged

LD0106084188 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT
1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Instruments of ratification of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles were exchanged in the Kremlin

today by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the President of the United States Ronald Reagan.

The instruments of ratification put on record the accords reached and are an expression of the mutual understanding attained by the world's two biggest powers on a crucial problem of the modern world—the problem of disarmament.

State flags of the USSR and the USA were on a big table in Vladimir Hall in the Grand Kremlin Palace, where by tradition Soviet leaders sign the most important international acts with heads of foreign delegations at summit level.

Present in the hall were representatives of the world's major media outlets. The printed and electronic media will acquaint billions of people throughout the world with every moment of this ceremony.

Soviet and American officials present in the hall met with applause the appearance of the leaders of the two great nations—Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

A solemn moment. Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan took their seats at the table and signed the protocols on the exchange of instruments of ratification.

Again there was applause. Yet another bright peaceful page has been inscribed in the history of mankind. This act of good will of the two great states is welcomed as a triumph of reason, as a new victory in the endeavour to improve the international situation.

After the signing of the protocols the two leaders made speeches.

Gorbachev Speech at Ratification

*LD0106101888 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0821 GMT 1 Jun 88*

[Speech by CPSU General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev at ceremony for signing of ratification documents of INF Treaty in the Kremlin Vladimirskiy Hall—live]

Esteemed Mr President,

Esteemed Mrs Reagan,

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen,

Comrades. The fourth meeting in 3 years between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States is coming to an end, and the visit to our country by the U.S. President is coming to an end.

The President and I have reviewed the results of the dialogue at the highest level between our two countries and have discussed prospects for Soviet-U.S. relations in the very near and more distant future. Documents have

been signed that record what has been achieved and provide guidelines for the future. The ratification documents that bring the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles into force will occupy a historic place among them.

The exchange of ratification instruments that has taken place in the last few minutes marks the start of the era of nuclear disarmament. In assessing work done in the past few days we have every right to say that what has taken place in the past few days in Moscow is big politics, that is the sort of politics that touches on the interests of millions and millions of people. Each such meeting has dealt a blow against the foundations of the cold war. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 2 June 1988 in its Second Edition carries the Gorbachev ratification speech on page 1 under the headline "Historic Treaty Enters Force". The PRAVDA version renders the words "cold war" within quotation marks in the preceding sentence.] Each meeting has pierced huge breaches in the cold war fortress [The PRAVDA version renders the preceding phrase as: "...huge breaches in its fortress..."] and opened a way out to the vast expanse of a modern, civilized world politics, worthy of a truly new time.

But big politics means difficult politics. Each step comes with difficulty. In adjusting each new step we take, we measure it up against the security interests of our own peoples and of the whole world. For that is the only way we can move toward really major results that have the necessary margin of viability.

Big politics is also a big responsibility, and therefore it cannot be built solely in one's own interest, which is always inevitably one-sided. Such politics also require a great idea. Mankind has achieved it through the suffering of wars and catastrophes, tragedies and events, calamities, strivings, and discoveries of the 20th century. [The PRAVDA version renders the preceding sentence: "Mankind has achieved it through the suffering of wars and catastrophes, tragedies and calamities, strivings, and discoveries of the 20th century."] We consider this idea to be the idea of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. That indeed is what determines the mandate which the Soviet people entrust to their representatives when they go to talks. And to an even greater extent it concerns talks with a power like the United States.

In addressing from these renowned steps of the Moscow Kremlin the Soviet people and the Americans and all peoples I state: We have acted honestly and persistently and will continue to do so in the future in carrying out this historic mandate.

The first lines in the book of a world without wars, without violence, and without nuclear weapons have already been written, and I think that no one will now manage to slam this book shut and set it aside.

President Reagan and I agreed that the next task facing us is to conclude a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons. It can and must be accomplished. In our joint labors and discussions we have learned to understand each other better and to take into account what worries our partner and to seek solutions. The atmosphere of our relations is improving and we are trying to make this a constant feature, not only in our official contacts but also in the day-to-day practice of Soviet-U.S. relations and here, too, we are guided by the instructions of our people.

Thanks to the atmosphere at the Washington and Moscow summits and as a result of the accords that have been achieved, the U.S. and Soviet people have greater opportunities for contacts [The PRAVDA version reads: "...U.S. and Soviet people now have greater opportunities of contacts..."] and for getting to know each other. Scientists, students, schoolchildren, cultural figures, and ordinary tourists, sportsmen and business people, I am sure, [The PRAVDA version reads: "...tourists, sportsmen and, of course, business people, I am sure..."] will expand still further and add new colors to the fabric of cooperation and friendly links. Sometimes they can do this better than politicians.

The historians who will describe and evaluate what is now happening have probably not yet been born. But children are born every day who will live in the 21st century and to whom we must leave a legacy of a secure and humane world. On behalf of the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people I want to say to everyone who is thinking with anxiety and hope about the future; we will work for this and we can achieve our aim only if we work together.

Thank you. [applause]

Reagan Speaks on Ratification

PM0206105988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 June 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report on speech made by President Ronald Reagan at a Kremlin ceremony on 1 June at which instruments of ratification of the U.S.-Soviet Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles were exchanged, under the headline "Historic Treaty Comes Into Force"]

[Text] Mr. General Secretary,

These are historic moments. As we exchanged these documents—the instruments of ratification—this treaty, the terms of which we formally agreed to last December in Washington, enters into force.

Mr. General Secretary, you know that our way here has not been easy. At crucial moments your personal intervention was needed and proved decisive, and for this we are grateful.

You also know, Mr General Secretary, the great importance which has been devoted—not only by me personally, but in the policy of my administration from the outset—not only to arms limitation, but to arms reduction."

Seven years ago, when I first suggested the concept of the double zero treaty, there were those who said that this was so unrealistic an idea that it was irresponsible even to propose it. Others simply dismissed the concept as a propaganda ploy or geopolitical gambit.

But scepticism and doubt produce a barren harvest. And today on this table before us we see the fruits of hope, evidence of what candor and realism can accomplish. We have dared to hope, Mr. General Secretary, and our hopes have been justified.

For the first time in history an entire class of U.S.-Soviet nuclear missiles is eliminated. In addition, this treaty provides for the most stringent verification in history and for the first time inspection teams are actually in residence in our respective countries.

And while this treaty makes possible a new dimension of cooperation between us, much remains on our agenda. We must not stop here, Mr. General Secretary, there is much more to be done.

As will be seen in our joint statement later today, more progress has been made toward a strategic arms treaty during our meetings. We must try to move forward in the months ahead to complete the START treaty as soon as possible.

So let us continue to expand the frontiers of trust even as we verify, Mr. General Secretary, even as we verify.

Mr. General Secretary, we have agreed many times that there remain differences, important, fundamental differences between us. Yet, as we work over the long run to narrow these differences, as we work for what I hope will be a new era of peace and expanded human freedom, we must also acknowledge our solemn responsibility to take steps now to reduce the chances of conflict and to prevent war.

This we have done today. A first step toward a brighter future, a safer world.

America's allies and friends welcome this treaty, too. We consulted them fully during its negotiation. We made clear that we would never put their security or their interests at risk, but on the contrary we would sign a treaty only if it enhanced their security, as this one does.

And finally, if I may, I would like to take a moment to thank the United States Senate for their work on this treaty. The way of democracy is sometimes a complicated way, and sometimes difficult. But it is a good way, and, we believe, the best way.

And once again, Mr. General Secretary, I want to extend to you and all those who labored so hard for this moment my warmest personal thanks.

Officials' Attendance Noted

LD0106134288 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1130 GMT 1 Jun 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The final ratification documents of the INF Treaty were signed in the Kremlin today. The signing was attended on the Soviet side by Comrades Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Ligachev, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Demichev, Dolgikh, Maslyukov, Razumovskiy, Talyzin, Yazov, Baklanov, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Lukyanov, Medvedev, and Kapitonov; deputy chairmen of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR; heads of a number of ministries and departments; military commanders; and prominent figures from the world of science and culture. The United States was represented by Secretary of State Shultz and other officials accompanying the President.

Joint Summit Statement

LD0106155488 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT
1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Following is the full text of the Soviet-American joint statement:

Joint statement between

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States

Issued following meetings in Moscow, USSR May 29-June 1, 1988

In accordance with the understanding reached during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva in November 1985, and confirmed at the Washington summit in December 1987, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, and Ronald W. Reagan, President of the United States of America, met in Moscow May 29-June 2, 1988.

Attending on the Soviet side were Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Andrey A. Gromyko; Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard A. Shevardnadze; member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Aleksandr N. Yakovlev; Alternate Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Defence of the USSR, Dmitriy T. Yazov; Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy F. Dobrynin; Assistant to the General Secretary of the

CPSU Central Committee, Anatoliy S. Chernyaev; Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Aleksandr A. Bessmertnykh; and Ambassador of the USSR to the United States of America Yuriy V. Dubinin.

Attending on the U.S. side were Secretary of State George P. Shultz; Secretary of Defence Frank C. Carlucci; Presidential Chief of Staff Howard H. Baker, Jr.; Assistant to the President for National Security Colin L. Powell; Ambassador at Large and Special Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State on Arms Control Matters, Paul H. Nitze; Special Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State on Arms Control Matters, Ambassador Edward L. Rowny; Ambassador of the U.S. to the USSR Jack F. Matlock; and Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Rozanne L. Ridgway.

The general secretary and the President view the Moscow summit as an important step in the process of putting Soviet-U.S. relations on a more productive and sustainable basis. Their comprehensive and detailed discussions covered the full agenda of issues to which the two leaders agreed during their initial meeting in Geneva in November, 1985—an agenda encompassing arms control, human rights and humanitarian matters, settlement of regional conflicts, and bilateral relations. Serious differences remain on important issues; the frank dialogue which has developed between the two countries remains critical to surmounting these differences.

The talks took place in a constructive atmosphere which provided ample opportunity for candid exchange. As a result, the sides achieved a better understanding of each other's positions. The two leaders welcomed the progress achieved in various areas of Soviet-U.S. relations since their last meeting in Washington, notwithstanding the difficulty and complexity of the issues. They noted with satisfaction numerous concrete agreements which have been achieved, and expressed their determination to redouble efforts in the months ahead in areas where work remains to be done. They praised the creative and intensive efforts made by representatives of both sides in recent months to resolve outstanding differences.

Assessing the state of Soviet-U.S. relations, the general secretary and the President underscored the historic importance of their meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, and Moscow in laying the foundation for a realistic approach to the problems of strengthening stability and reducing the risk of conflict. They reaffirmed their solemn conviction that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, their determination to prevent any war between the Soviet Union and the United States, whether nuclear or conventional, and their disavowal of any intention to achieve military superiority.

The two leaders are convinced that the expanding political dialogue they have established represents an increasingly effective means of resolving issues of mutual interest and concern. They do not minimize the real

differences of history, tradition and ideology which will continue to characterize the Soviet-U.S. relationship. But they believe that the dialogue will endure, because it is based on realism and focused on the achievement of concrete results. It can serve as a constructive basis for addressing not only the problems of the present, but of tomorrow and the next century. It is a process which the general secretary and the President believe serves the best interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States, and can contribute to a more stable, more peaceful and safer world.

I.

Arms Control [subhead]

The general secretary and the President, having expressed the commitment of their two countries to build on progress to date in arms control, determined objectives and next steps on a wide range of issues in this area. These will guide the efforts of the two governments in the months ahead as they work with each other and with other states toward equitable, verifiable agreements that strengthen international stability and security.

INF [subhead]

The general secretary and the President signed the protocol on the exchange of instruments of ratification of the treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The two leaders welcomed the entry into force of this historic agreement, which for the first time will eliminate an entire class of Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms, and which sets new standards for arms control. The leaders are determined to achieve the full implementation of all the provisions and understandings of the treaty, viewing joint and successful work in this respect as an important precedent for future arms control efforts.

Nuclear and Space Talks [subhead]

The two leaders noted that a joint draft text of a treaty on reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms has been elaborated. Through this process, the sides have been able to record in the joint draft text extensive and significant areas of agreement and also to detail positions on remaining areas of disagreement. While important additional work is required before this treaty is ready for signature, many key provisions are recorded in the joint draft text and are considered to be agreed, subject to the completion and ratification of the treaty.

Taking into account a treaty on strategic offensive arms, the sides have continued negotiations to achieve a separate agreement concerning the ABM Treaty building on the language of the Washington summit joint statement dated December 10, 1987. Progress was noted in preparing the joint draft text of an associated protocol. In connection with their obligations under the protocol, the

sides have agreed in particular to use the nuclear risk reduction centres for transmission of relevant information. The leaders directed their negotiators to prepare the joint draft text of a separate agreement and to continue work on its associated protocol.

The joint draft treaty on reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms reflects the earlier understanding on establishing ceilings of no more than 1,600 strategic offensive delivery systems and 6,000 warheads as well as agreement on subceilings of 4,900 on the aggregate of ICBM and SLBM warheads and 1,540 warheads on 154 heavy missiles.

The draft treaty also records the sides' agreement that as a result of the reductions the aggregate throw-weight of the Soviet Union's ICBMs and SLBMs will be reduced to a level approximately 50 per cent below the existing level and this level will not be exceeded.

During the negotiations the two sides have also achieved understanding that in future work on the treaty they will act on the understanding that on deployed ICBMs and SLBMs of existing types the counting rule will include the number of warheads referred to in the joint statement of December 10, 1987, and the number of warheads which will be attributed to each new type of ballistic missile will be subject to negotiation.

In addition, the sides agreed on a counting rule for heavy bomber armaments according to which heavy bombers equipped only for nuclear gravity bombs and SRAMS will count as one delivery vehicle against the 1,600 limit and one warhead against the 6,000 limit.

The delegations have also prepared joint draft texts of an inspection protocol, a conversion or elimination protocol, and a memorandum of understanding on data, which are integral parts of the treaty. These documents build on the verification provisions of the INF Treaty, extending and elaborating them as necessary to meet the more demanding requirements of START. The START verification measures will, at a minimum, include:

A. Data exchanges, to include declarations and appropriate notifications on the number and location of weapons systems limited by START, including locations and facilities for production, final assembly, storage, testing, repair, training, deployment, conversion, and elimination of such systems. Such declarations will be exchanged between the sides before the treaty is signed and updated periodically.

B. Baseline inspections to verify the accuracy of these declarations.

C. On-site observation or elimination of strategic systems necessary to meet the agreed limits.

D. Continuous on-site monitoring of the perimeter and portals of critical production facilities to confirm the output of weapons to be limited.

E. Short-notice on-site inspection of:

(i) declared locations during the process of reducing to agreed limits;

(ii) locations where systems covered by this treaty remain after achieving the agreed limits; and

(iii) locations where such systems have been located (formerly declared facilities).

F. Short-notice inspection, in accordance with agreed upon procedures, of locations where either side considers covert deployment, production, storage or repair of strategic offensive arms could be occurring.

G. Prohibition of the use of concealment or other activities which impede verification by national technical means. Such provisions would include a ban on telemetry encryption and would allow for full access to all telemetric information broadcast during missile flight.

H. Procedures that enable verification of the number of warheads on deployed ballistic missiles of each specific type, including on-site inspection.

I. Enhanced observation of activities related to reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms by national technical means. These would include open displays of treaty-limited items at missile bases, bomber bases, and submarine ports at locations and times chosen by the inspecting party.

The two sides have also begun to exchange data on their strategic forces.

During the course of this meeting in Moscow, the exchanges on START resulted in the achievement of substantial additional common ground, particularly in the areas of ALCMs and the attempts to develop and agree, if possible, on a solution to the problem of verification of mobile ICBMs. The details of this additional common ground have been recorded in documents exchanged between the sides. The delegations in Geneva will record these gains in the joint draft text of the START treaty.

The sides also discussed the question of limiting long-range, nuclear-armed SLCMs.

M.S. Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan expressed their joint confidence that the extensive work done provides the basis for concluding the treaty on reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms which will promote strategic stability and strengthen security not only of the peoples of the USSR and the USA, but of all mankind.

Guided by this fundamental agreement, the general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the U.S. President agreed to continue their efforts in this area energetically and purposefully. The delegations of the two countries have been instructed to return to Geneva on July 12, 1988. It has been agreed as a matter of principle that, once the remaining problems are solved and the treaty and its associated documents are agreed, they will be signed without delay.

Ballistic Missile Launch Notifications [subhead]

The agreement between the USSR and the U.S. on notifications of launches of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, signed during the Moscow summit, is a practical new step, reflecting the desire of the sides to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war, in particular as a result of misinterpretation, miscalculation or accident.

Nuclear testing [subhead]

The leaders reaffirmed the commitment of the two sides to conduct in a single forum full-scale, stage-by-stage negotiations on the issues relating to nuclear testing. In these negotiations the sides as the first step will agree upon effective verification measures which will make it possible to ratify the USSR-U.S. Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974 and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty of 1976, and proceed to negotiating further intermediate limitations on nuclear testing leading to the ultimate objective of the complete cessation of nuclear testing as part of an effective disarmament process. This process, among other things, would pursue, as the first priority, the goal of the reduction of nuclear weapons and, ultimately, their elimination. In implementing the first objective of these negotiations, agreement upon effective verification measures for the USSR-U.S. Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974, the sides agreed to design and conduct a joint verification experiment at each other's test sites.

The leaders therefore noted with satisfaction the signing of the Joint Verification Experiment Agreement, the considerable preparation underway for the experiment, and the positive cooperation being exhibited in particular by the substantial numbers of personnel now engaged in work at each other's test sites. They also noted the substantial progress on a new protocol to the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty and urged continuing constructive negotiations on effective verification measures for the Threshold Test Ban Treaty.

Expressing their conviction that the progress achieved so far forms a solid basis for continuing progress on issues relating to nuclear testing, the leaders instructed their negotiators to complete expeditiously the preparation of a protocol to the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty and to complete the preparation of a protocol to the Threshold Test Ban Treaty as soon as possible after the joint

verification experiment has been conducted and analyzed. They confirmed their understanding that verification measures for the TTBT will, to the extent appropriate, be used in further nuclear test limitation agreements which may subsequently be reached. They also declared their mutual intention to seek ratification of both the 1974 and 1976 treaties when the corresponding protocols to the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty are completed, and to continue negotiations as agreed in the Washington joint summit statement.

Nuclear Non-Proliferation [subhead]

The two leaders noted that this year marks the 20th anniversary of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, one of the most important international arms control agreements with over 130 adherents. They reaffirmed their conviction that universal adherence to the NPT is important to international peace and security. They expressed the hope that each state not a party to the treaty will join it, or make an equally binding commitment under international law to forego acquisition of nuclear weapons and prevent nuclear weapons proliferation. This will enhance the possibility of progress toward reducing nuclear armaments and reduce the threat of nuclear war.

The two leaders also confirmed their support of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and agreed that they would continue efforts to further strengthen it. They reaffirmed the value of their regular consultations on non-proliferation and agreed that they should continue.

Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers [subhead]

The leaders expressed satisfaction over the activation of the new communications link between the nuclear risk reduction centers in Moscow and Washington, established in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. agreement on September 15, 1987. It was agreed that the centers can play an important role in the context of a future treaty on reducing U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear arms.

Chemical Weapons [subhead]

The leaders reviewed the status of on-going multilateral negotiations and bilateral Soviet-U.S. consultations toward a comprehensive, effectively verifiable, and truly global ban on chemical weapons, encompassing all chemical weapons-capable states. They also expressed concern over the growing problem of chemical weapons proliferation and use.

The leaders reaffirmed the importance of efforts to address, as a matter of continuing urgency, the unique challenges of a chemical weapons ban and to achieve an effective convention. While noting the progress already achieved in the talks and the difficult problems with regard to effective monitoring of the global prohibition of chemical weapons and the non-use of dual-capable

chemicals for chemical weapons purposes, the leaders underlined the need for concrete solutions to the problems of ensuring effective verification and undiminished security for all convention participants. They gave instructions to their respective delegations to this effect.

Both sides agreed on the vital importance of greater openness by all states as a way to build confidence and strengthen the foundation for an effective convention. The leaders also emphasized the necessity of close coordination on a multilateral basis in order to ensure the participation of all CW-possessing and CW-capable states in the convention.

Both sides strongly condemn the dangerous spread and illegal use of chemical weapons in violation of the 1925 Geneva protocol. They stressed the importance of both technical and political solutions to this problem and confirmed their support for international investigations of suspected violation. Noting the initial efforts being made to control the export of chemicals used in manufacturing chemical weapons, the leaders called on all nations with the capability of producing such chemicals to institute stringent export controls to inhibit the proliferation of chemical weapons.

Conventional Arms Control [subhead]

The leaders emphasized the importance of strengthening stability and security in the whole of Europe. They welcomed progress to date on development of a mandate for new negotiations on armed forces and conventional armaments. They expressed their hope for an early and balanced conclusion to the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting. The general secretary and the President also noted that full implementation of the provisions of the document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe can significantly increase openness and mutual confidence.

They also discussed the situation in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) negotiations in Vienna. Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [subhead]

They expressed their commitment to further development of the CSCE process. The USSR and the U.S. will continue to work with the other 33 participants to bring the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting to a successful conclusion, through significant results in all the principal areas of the Helsinki Final Act and Madrid concluding document.

Ballistic Missile Technology Proliferation [subhead]

The leaders agreed to bilateral discussions at the level of experts on the problem of proliferation of ballistic missile technology.

Third Special Session of the UN General Assembly [subhead]

The general secretary and the President noted the importance of the ongoing third special session on disarmament.

II. Human Rights and Humanitarian Concerns [subhead]

The general secretary and the President engaged in a detailed discussion of human rights and humanitarian concerns. The leaders reviewed the increasingly broad and detailed Soviet-U.S. dialogue in this area and agreed that it should be conducted at all levels in order to achieve sustained, concrete progress. They noted that this dialogue should seek to maximize assurance of the rights, freedoms and human dignity of individuals; promotion of people-to-people communications and contacts; active sharing of spiritual, cultural, historical and other values; and greater mutual understanding and respect between the two countries. Toward this end, they discussed the possible establishment of a forum which, meeting regularly, would bring together participants from across the range of their two societies. They noted steps already taken to establish the exchange of information and contacts between legislative bodies of both countries, as well as discussions between legal experts, physicians and representatives of other professions directly involved in matters pertaining to human rights, and between representatives of non-governmental organizations.

III. Regional Issues [subhead]

The general secretary and the President thoroughly discussed a wide range of regional questions, including the Middle East, the Iran-Iraq war, southern Africa, the Horn of Africa, Central America, Cambodia, the Korean peninsula, and other issues. They expressed satisfaction with the April, 1988, conclusion in Geneva of accords on an Afghanistan settlement. Although the discussions revealed serious differences both in the assessment of the causes of regional tensions and in the means to overcome them, the leaders agreed that these differences need not be an obstacle to constructive interaction between the USSR and the U.S.

They reaffirmed their intention to continue Soviet-U.S. discussions at all levels aimed at helping parties to regional conflicts find peaceful solutions which advance their independence, freedom and security. They emphasized the importance of enhancing the capacity of the United Nations and other international institutions to contribute to the resolution of regional conflicts.

IV. Bilateral Affairs [subhead]

The general secretary and the President reviewed progress in further expanding bilateral contacts, exchanges and cooperation since their meeting in

Washington, D.C. In December, 1987. They noted the increasingly important role that mutually beneficial interchange between the two countries can play in improving mutual understanding and providing stability in the Soviet-U.S. relationship. They stated their intention to intensify such ties.

They noted with particular satisfaction that concrete agreements had been reached in most of the areas identified at their meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington.

Bilateral Agreements and Cooperative Activities [subhead]

The general secretary and the President welcomed the conclusion of a number of bilateral agreements which open new opportunities for fruitful cooperation in the following fields: cooperation in transportation science and technology; maritime search and rescue; operational coordination between Soviet and U.S. radionavigation systems in the Northern Pacific and Bering Sea; and mutual fisheries relations.

The two leaders welcomed the recent signing of a new memorandum on civilian nuclear reactor safety under the bilateral agreement on peaceful uses of atomic energy. There was an exchange of notes to extend that agreement.

They expressed satisfaction with the recent signing of a new protocol under the bilateral housing agreement for cooperation in construction research relating to extreme geological and unusual climatic conditions.

They reviewed the status of negotiations between the two countries concerning maritime shipping, the USSR-U.S. maritime boundary, basic scientific research, and emergency pollution clean-up in the Bering and Chukchi Seas. They instructed their negotiators to accelerate efforts to achieve mutually acceptable agreements in these areas at the earliest opportunity.

The two leaders welcomed the start of bilateral discussions on combatting narcotics trafficking. They noted with satisfaction ongoing consultations between the two sides concerning law of the sea, air and sea transportation safety, and areas of mutual interest in the field of law.

Cultural and People-to-People Exchanges [subhead]

Noting the expansion of exchanges in the areas of education, science, culture and sports under the general exchanges agreement, the two leaders welcomed the signing of a new implementing program for 1989-91 under the agreement and expressed their intention to continue expansion of such exchanges. During the time in which this program is in force, the two sides, taking into consideration their mutual interest as well as financial and technical conditions, will conduct negotiations

on the opening of culture/information centers in the USSR and the U.S. with the aim of signing an appropriate agreement on behalf of the governments of both countries.

They expressed satisfaction that, over the course of their dialogue, people-to-people contacts and exchanges between non-governmental organizations have significantly increased and become one of the most dynamic elements in the bilateral relationship. They reaffirmed their commitment to further growth of such exchanges, which contribute to mutual understanding, and welcomed plans for increased exchanges of young people in the future. In this context, they expressed their readiness to consider in practical terms the idea of further developing exchanges of high school students. They cited recent joint Soviet-U.S. initiatives on culture, theater and the cinema as examples of new opportunities to engage those involved in the creative arts.

Noting the rapidly growing sports ties between the two countries, including their National Olympic Committees, the two leaders expressed their support for the international Olympic movement, which promotes international cooperation and understanding through athletic competition.

Other Cooperative Activities [subhead]

The general secretary and the President noted the successful expansion of scientific cooperation within the framework of bilateral agreements in environmental protection, medical science and public health, artificial heart research and development, agriculture, and studies of the world ocean, and expressed their intention to continue to expand activities under these agreements in areas of mutual benefit to the two sides.

The general secretary and the President noted with pleasure the commencement of work on a conceptual design of an international thermonuclear experimental reactor (ITER), under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency, between scientists and experts from the Soviet Union, United States, European Atomic Energy community, and Japan. The two leaders noted the significance of this next step toward the development of fusion power as a cheap, environmentally sound, and essentially inexhaustible energy source for the benefit of all mankind.

The general secretary and the President welcomed agreement by representatives of the Soviet Union, United States, Canada and France, to institutionalize in the near future the COSPAS/SARSAT space-based, life-saving global search and rescue system.

Both leaders reaffirmed their support for the WHO/UNICEF goal of reducing the scale of preventable childhood death through the most effective methods of saving children. They urged other countries and the international community to intensify efforts to achieve this goal.

Global Climate and Environmental Change Initiative [subhead]

The two leaders expressed their satisfaction with activities since the Washington summit in expanding cooperation with respect to global climate and environmental change, including in areas of mutual concern relating to environmental protection, such as protection and conservation of stratospheric ozone and a possible global warming trend. They emphasized their desire to make more active use of the unique opportunities afforded by the space programs of the two countries to conduct global monitoring of the environment and the ecology of the earth's land, oceans and atmosphere. They underscored the need to continue to promote both bilateral and multilateral cooperation in this important area in the future.

Initiative for Expanded Civil Space Cooperation [subhead]

Recognizing the long-standing commitment of both countries to space science and exploration, and noting the progress made under the 1987 USSR-U.S. cooperative agreement in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, the two leaders agreed to a new initiative to expand civil space cooperation by exchanging flight opportunities for scientific instruments to fly on each other's spacecraft, and by exchanging results of independent national studies of future unmanned solar system exploration missions as a means of assessing prospects for further Soviet-U.S. cooperation on such missions. They also agreed to expand exchanges of space science data and of scientists, to enhance the scientific benefit that can be derived from the two countries' space research missions. They noted scientific missions to the Moon and Mars as areas of possible bilateral and international cooperation.

Arctic Contacts and Cooperation [subhead]

Taking into account the unique environmental, demographic and other characteristics of the Arctic, the two leaders reaffirmed their support for expanded bilateral and regional contacts and cooperation in this area. They noted plans and opportunities for increased scientific and environmental cooperation under a number of bilateral agreements as well as within an international Arctic science committee of states with interests in the region. They expressed their support for increased people-to-people contacts between the native peoples of Alaska and the Soviet North.

The general secretary and the President noted the positive role played by the multilateral Antarctic treaty and emphasized the importance of Soviet-U.S. scientific and environmental cooperation in that region.

Trade and Economic Affairs [subhead]

The two sides reconfirmed their strong support for the expansion of mutual beneficial trade and economic relations and noted recent activity in this area. They reiterated their belief that commercially viable joint ventures complying with the laws and regulations of both countries could play a role in the further development of commercial relations. They welcomed the results of the meeting of the joint USSR-U.S. commercial commission in April and noted with satisfaction that working groups had been created under the commission to further the establishment of better conditions under which mutually advantageous trade can develop. Taking note of the 1974 joint statement and protocol amending the long-term agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to facilitate economic, industrial and technical cooperation issued at the conclusion of the joint commercial commission, they agreed that the commission should continue to meet to build upon the forward momentum which has been generated.

The two leaders cited expanding relations between Aeroflot and Pan American Airlines under the government-to-government civil air transportation agreement as a positive example of mutually beneficial cooperation.

Consulates Exchange/Diplomatic and Consular Missions [subhead]

The general secretary and the President reaffirmed their agreement to open consulates general in Kiev and New York as soon as practicable.

The two leaders discussed questions relating to ensuring adequate and secure conditions for Soviet and U.S. diplomatic and consular establishments and their personnel in each other's territory. They agreed on the need to approach problems relating to such matters constructively and on the basis of reciprocity.

V. Future Meetings [subhead]

The general secretary and the President, recognizing the importance of their personal involvement in the development of relations in the months ahead, instructed Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and Secretary of State Shultz to meet as necessary and to report to them on ways to ensure continued practical progress across the full range of issues. Expert-level contacts will also continue on an intensified basis.

[Dated] Moscow, June 1, 1988

Gorbachev Press Statement

LD0106132088 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0927 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Opening statement at news conference by CPSU General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev at summit press center in Moscow—live]

[Text] I believe that a bad tradition has come into being, and it is starting to worry me: We have started being late for news conferences and I want again to apologize.

The debates took place on a single issue—I will tell you about it later—almost until 1145, and then we had to go for the signing. Everything was delayed.

This is our delegation that took part in the talks, with the exception of Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko. We are at your disposal.

Perhaps, following the tradition, I should say a few words on how we assess the outcome of the conference. The fourth summit in 3 years of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President is over. This is a statement, not just arithmetics, and I believe that it is a statement of great significance and great political impact. Four summits in 3 years. That characterizes the intensive nature of the political dialogue, and probably characterizes the nature and the level of our relations, and I believe that the fact in itself is very meaningful. Naturally, the question is asked throughout the world and, above all, in the Soviet Union and the United States—you probably ask it too: What has the summit meeting, the Moscow meeting, yielded and where has it led? Has it added something new to the previous meetings?

Let me begin by saying that all of us—and I am convinced of this—participated in a major event. The meeting has indeed again shown the importance of dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States and has yet again confirmed the correctness of the choice of the path made in Geneva 2 1/2 years ago. Through Reykjavik and Washington, this path has led to Moscow. It is a unique process in the history of the postwar period.

A question immediately arises, and it is of great importance for all of us to understand, both politicians and the public opinion, which shows a great interest in the way in which relations between our countries are taking shape. Over the 3 years during which I have occupied the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee I have had more than 200 meetings of an international nature. I cannot recall practically a single meeting—be it with friends from the socialist countries, or with representatives of capitalist countries or else with the representatives of the nonaligned countries—at which the idea was not stressed or voiced that everyone has an interest in having Soviet-U.S. relations transferred onto a normal, healthy course. This, surely, is understandable and I have already had occasion to speak of this; it is simply the reality. It is this that defines the weight carried by our countries and I would place, right here, the question of the responsibility that our countries carry. And here I pose the question: Why is it, all the same, that such an intensive dialogue, such a process that is of tremendous significance, has become possible? I think that it is thanks to realism.

I am speaking about the realism of the policies of both the Soviet Union and of the United States, because the existence of a realistic approach from only one side will not guarantee the possibility of such a process. I do not

intend now to engage in guesswork regarding where the confrontation would have led if it had continued and if the Kremlin and the White House were not sufficiently timely in their determination to turn the wheel in the necessary direction from confrontation to cooperation, to the search for areas and spheres of this cooperation, accompanied by the acceleration of political dialogue.

When this was understood, a dialogue started that was accompanied by talks and they, those talks, in their turn led to an agreement. Relations in which a terrible threat to the whole world was lurking, to the very existence of mankind, have started to gain a positive momentum. [Moscow TASS in English at 0010 GMT on 2 June transmit a report on the Gorbachev question and answer session, which renders the previous phrase: "...have started to change."] The most powerful states have started to reform their relations in their own interests and also in the interests of the world community.

This has certainly been far from easy. I talked about this only a few minutes ago when I and the President both spoke during the exchange of the instruments of ratification, but at the same time, although not everything is going simply, with difficulties, this is, all the same, also an important, productive, and a positive process on the whole.

Each one of the four meetings was a difficult but also a fruitful search for the balance of interests. Each one has increased the motivation to seek solutions to major problems of universal importance for mankind. To illustrate this, I recall—I take you back to Reykjavik—those who were there—to the whole Reykjavik drama—this is only one illustration of the extent of the difficulties, and sometimes in what dramatic forms this political dialogue between two leading countries, world powers, develops.

All the same, we are today summing up the results of the fourth meeting. Its main result is the continuation of the dialogue that now envelopes all the key problems of world policy and bilateral relations. The present meeting has demonstrated again that the dialogue has gone over to a realistic policy. I cannot say that these meetings have been freed from various propaganda moves, demarches, attempts to score points through such propaganda moves, but all the same, these meetings are showing more and more the striving, the wish, to do real politics. I am convinced that this is a correct path.

I am convinced that that is the right way, that it is precisely the right way to act. At the very first session in Washington, we at once perceived an attempt to instruct us; we declined that approach and said that we had arrived to deal in real politics. That was how we also acted at this fourth summit. And that was why in-depth, at times pointed discussion exemplified this summit, up to the last minute of the talks: When we were not sitting but by then standing up, a gang fight, as they say here in Russia.

Speaking of the present summit, I would like to stress the idea of continuity which prevailed throughout the entire atmosphere of the summit. What was also typical—and you will find that in the final document; it exists, there is a joint statement on almost 24 pages; I believe that it is a major document, a significant document; I will dwell on it more—is that on numerous occasions we turned to... [Gorbachev changes thought] and in the talks, the final document contains such an entry, the idea that in this dialogue of ours and in these documents that have been generated over the past few days, at the fourth summit, prerequisites, bricks were laid for building our future relations, for moving into the 21st century.

What has been achieved specifically? I believe that I should move ahead and, after the political dialogue—which I place at the head—I would further say that we have completed the process on medium- and shorter-range missiles. The fourth summit—and the preparations for it—pushed that process forward and we were able to exchange ratification instruments.

This is not merely a formality. I will even permit myself the use of a somewhat solemn...

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] It's not working for them.

[Gorbachev] Is it working where you are? It's not working? Not in English? Is it working now? One row is not working?

[Speaker] You're out of luck.

[Gorbachev] What are we going to do? Would those non-press representatives of the Soviet Union move to this row and give their places to the Americans here where it is working. Come along. Change places. Baklanov, this doesn't apply to you, you are with the press, after all. But there are other comrades sitting here. [laughter in hall] Come along, change places. Is it working now where you are? Brokaw, is it working where you are? It's not working over there, either? So why are you still sitting there? Come on, let's get up. But you can still hear me? Come here to the front, please; there are two places here. Good. There are still places here.

[Speaker] We refitted the hall for the party conference. All in all, it will be up to the task.

[Gorbachev] Can I continue? At last we have things in order—ordnung, as our German friends say.

I meant that the exchange of ratification instruments is not simply a formal act, and I will even permit myself to use this solemn expression: the completion of the procedure for putting the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles into force has made the Moscow meeting a landmark political event in Soviet-U.S. dialogue, and indeed in world politics.

It is not only the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States who can congratulate themselves, but also their allies and all of the world public, the entire world community. This is a general victory for reason and realism. It became possible because, on all continents and in all countries, regardless of their social choice and other values which each people chooses and defines for itself, there is now a general understanding that the world had reached the brink. We had to stop and the door had to be opened to allow things to run in the other direction along the path to a nuclear-free world, a nonviolent world, and improving international relations.

Many have made a real contribution, a substantial contribution to achieving this major victory. I must state the facts and note the contribution of the press. Even when the press asked the politicians and those involved in talks the most difficult questions, that too was a necessary contribution for it made it possible to put the talks on a certain specific and convincing level for finding solutions, for arguing, and for devising forms of verification. And so I want, I consider it my duty to note the contribution of the press.

I think that it is now a matter of honor—this concerns primarily the Soviet Union and the United States, but also other states—to ensure that each letter of this treaty, each comma, is observed and implemented.

The President and I went on to approve a joint statement, as I have already said. It sums up the work done after the Washington meeting and what has been done here in Moscow. At the same time the statement confirms a sort of agenda for Soviet-U.S. dialogue in the future. In a word, it is an important political document that marks a whole phase in our relations.

The most significant clauses in it are those relating to the importance of continuing to step up political dialogue between countries and intensifying the talks. I would also note progress in disarmament. It is a very difficult process, especially when it comes to strategic offensive weapons. It does not go simply. It is obviously the most complex task that we have run up against in postwar world politics. Resolving it is no simple matter. But here I must say firmly: gradually we are moving in the direction of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons.

And when today one of the correspondents—perhaps present this morning—asked if after the talks that have taken place I can keep up my optimism regarding the conclusion of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons already this year, under this administration, I would say that if the business is conducted effectively and if the administration—well, perhaps from the point of view of the U.S. Administration, if we—as it affects both sides—if we act effectively, making use of our opportunities, we can get within reach of a treaty.

I want to draw your attention to our initiative, strongly set in motion, on the talks on the reduction of arms and armed forces in Europe. The initiative has been published. I don't want to repeat myself, if you have any questions or anything needs to be clarified, you ask.

A whole package of bilateral relations... [Gorbachev changes thought] agreements has been signed between our countries. They have been published too.

There was in-depth discussion of the problem of regional conflicts. This problem was raised at all my meetings with the President and at the two plenary sessions. Today in particular this problem was examined most fundamentally. I think we have come to a situation when we must note that here, too, in the world's hot spots real opportunities have appeared for solving these regional problems, for untying these knots, tight knots, on the basis of political approaches, on the basis of a balance of interests.

Essentially today we have noted: First, there is Afghanistan, I will have more to say on that. Second, there is the process on issues of the Near East. This process is moving and there is a rapprochement of the positions. Understanding is ripening that there is also a need for a solution via an international conference. This is now already acknowledged; now it is only a question of what is to be understood by such a conference. But this means work, further work to amplify all these questions. There is the Cambodian problem. Thanks to the initiative displayed by Vietnam and Cambodia in the last few days, this is being moved to the plane of problems that could be solved in the near future. There is movement in Central America. In southern Africa a real process is in motion and solutions are possible, and so on.

I think, of course, that if my arguments were seen as some sort of unjustified optimism and as though I am trying to portray what is desirable as reality—I think that you would have been wrong. Well, let us recall what it looked like 3 or 4 years ago and what it looks like today. The situation has changed substantially. Opportunities have opened up for a political solution to all these conflicts. Tremendous forces have been activated within the framework of these regions and in the world as a whole.

In the conversations with the President and with all U.S. representatives, all along I stressed the main idea: We must not lose, or let slip—for this will evidently be more precise—the opportunity. In connection with this I said to the President outright that, well, the signing of the agreement on Afghanistan is a precedent which, as far as its significance is concerned, goes beyond the framework of this problem alone, since this is the first case where the Soviet Union and the United States, along with the specific participants in this conflict, have signed an agreement that paves the way for a political solution to this problem.

We will try, we will do everything to keep to the agreement. We expect the very same from all the participants, the sides, and from the United States. I think that if this time we do not get a positive...if this positive precedent fails to take place, it will have far-reaching consequences and will affect the approaches to solving these problems in the remaining regions. And we have felt...we have already been alarmed by two aspects. In the first place, Kabul, the Soviet Embassy, our troops in Kabul are being fired upon. In the second place, yesterday, in the region of Qandahar, our comrades lost their lives; several people are lost without a trace. We said that from the moment of troop withdrawals, the Soviet troops would not take part in military operations and that is how we have acted. However, we did make a proviso: If there are no provocations and bandit attacks on our troops. If this takes place, we will react and we will react in a corresponding manner. This, too, ought to be clear. Accords are accords.

We see what Pakistan is doing and, in connection with this, the Foreign Ministry issued a statement. I do not wish to go into details on this question. I merely emphasize that attempts to wreck this agreement are taking place and this would have adverse consequences, serious adverse consequences. The President and the entire U.S. delegation have been told this quite plainly.

I think that we, both the United States and the Soviet Union, can make a constructive contribution to the solving of regional conflicts on the basis of political approaches, on the basis of taking into account the balance, on the basis of the balance of interests of all the participants in various conflicts, on the basis of realism. On humanitarian issues, on human rights, I can declare substantial progress in the following sense. I posed the question to the President in the following way—instances relevant to that sphere do occur; there are individual instances that do occur. We have always examined them and will examine them carefully, and we are tackling them. Obstacles regarding emigration, in particular, are just some of them, and I have already spoken of this.

But the longer I ponder over the situation, the closer I am to concluding. No, I can see that the U.S. Administration lacks real understanding, understanding of the real situation with human rights, with the processes taking place in the sphere of democracy in our country. We probably also lack clear understanding of the U.S. situation in this aspect of life of U.S. society.

I have suggested the following: Let us organize in the framework of interparliamentary exchanges a standing seminar where representatives of our parliaments, political circles, and social circles could meet and exchange information and estimates of what takes place in the United States in that sphere, and what the Americans have assessed as the situation here, in our society, on those issues. We are ready for that. For the time being, there is a great deal of speculation in that matter.

I must say that that was the part of the visit, of the fourth summit, where propaganda moves and all kinds of spectacles featured too prominently. That is why, when I acquainted myself—I acquainted myself with some delay, it was only today that I learned it, for I have not had much time for reading the press recently—that our press reacted in a fitting way, and I believe that they did the right thing in the framework of glasnost. It was necessary to show that part of the visit, too, to our people, to let our people know everything. But I am not overjoyed with that part of the fourth summit, not overjoyed. Let us get back to real politics.

When the President voiced his considerations to me concerning human rights in the Soviet Union, I asked him many questions. And he had to go into long explanations of what it is like so that I would change my opinion on human rights in the United States. But having listened to everything he had to say, I told him: Mr President, your explanations are not convincing, because what I told you was based on the data of the U.S. Congress—not to mention the press, which provides a lot of evidence.

In my situation, it is better to proceed from official data. That is how it is. I believe it is correct like this. Let us see each other with open eyes. Let us see each other's history, traditions, values, leanings. In the final analysis, let us respect each other's choice, respect our peoples. After all, it is they who make the choice. Incidentally, the peoples are in favor of getting closer, getting to know each other, and even of friendliness. Both the Americans and our people speak of it openly. The President heard a lot on that account yesterday. So, let us listen closely to what our people want. Do you remember, Tom Brokaw, we spoke about that? That politicians should—since they were elected by the people—be able to tune into the aspirations of the people and implement them in real politics. You must assist that process, since we have set out to make healthier both our Soviet-U.S. relations and the situation throughout the world.

I must say that the fact that the U.S. President was enabled to mix with the Soviet people is an essential point, I believe, of his visit to the Soviet Union. This was the first visit for the President and his spouse, their first acquaintance, their first impressions. Much has taken place within the framework of the agenda, they have also acted a lot as they chose themselves, outside the agenda, in order to add to their impressions of the Soviet Union and of Soviet people. In that connection, I believe that Mrs Reagan's agenda was also an essential element, that also offered opportunities for getting acquainted with Soviet society.

And what is more, I heard, for example, many interesting things from the President when he talked to our people even when I was present, and he also said some interesting things to the correspondents. Someone asked yesterday—and I believe the press carried it today, as far as I can see—Mr President, do you still consider the Soviet

Union an evil empire, and he said: No. Incidentally, he said that at the news conference near the Tsar Cannon in the Kremlin, in the heart of that evil empire. We take note of this.

So, as the Greeks—the ancient Greeks—said, everything flows, everything changes. That only goes to show and confirm my thought that the President does have a sense of realism, and that is a very essential quality for a politician. What is needed is to look realities straight in the face, no matter what they are. Only politics built on analysis and on evaluations of real processes deserves to be called politics. Everything else is something... [Gorbachev changes thought] it is a substitute for politics, and not politics.

Well, I think it would be better for the President to tell you what he thinks about his meetings. I got a bit carried away and started speaking for the President. But I only mention those utterances of the President that I witnessed myself.

Overall, I would sum it up like this: The President's visit and the talks that have been held these past few days will serve to improve both Soviet-U.S. relations, their development, and strengthening, and will raise them to a still higher level. That is the actual state of how things are concerning the results, to put it briefly. Would it have been possible to achieve more? This always interests you. It interests us too. We have just had one discussion, because of which I arrived late together with my colleagues, and we concluded it without moving forward, stopping half-way. I would say, well politics is the art of the possible. So, I believe that more could have been achieved at that meeting.

For example, I proposed to the President to make a big new step in stating political realities of today as a platform for intentions and political actions; moreover, I and my colleagues in the leadership proceeded from this, from the experience that we have built up since Geneva. At that time we stated: nuclear war is impossible and impermissible, there can be no winners in it, and in general any war between the Soviet Union and the United States is impermissible. There was a series of other statements. It did not mean that on the day after or the week after the meeting everything would be solved and there would be no nuclear weapons. No. They are still here. But it was a powerful statement, a joint statement with immense meaning. And it received a strong echo in the world, in all circles.

Now, when we have seen that world problems are not to be solved by military methods, we are increasingly coming to the conclusion that they must be solved by political means, on the basis of a balance of interests, on the basis of respect for social choice. And whether we like it or not, we must all learn to live in peace, in the real world.

If you take the latest book containing a speech by the President, and take the latest selected articles and speeches by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in both cases you will see these statements, you will find them there. They are there.

Proceeding from that, we say that there is an understanding, that there are lessons we have drawn from the past few years. We proposed: Let us make that political statement in the current joint declaration. This is the draft statement I offered the President.

Using as our starting point an understanding of the existing realities of the modern world, both of us believe that no disputed issues are unsolvable and they should not be resolved through war; that we see peaceful coexistence as a universal principle in international relations; and that equality of all states, noninterference in internal affairs, and freedom of socio-political choice must be recognized as inalienable and compulsory standards for all.

I gave the President a Russian text and an English text. He read them and said: I like it. When we arrived today to agree on the final text of the final joint statement it turned out that not everyone in the President's entourage liked this statement. And that was what our discussion centered on. Fine. We felt that the term "peaceful coexistence" was not liked, especially since at one time it was used in documents that were signed with the Soviet leadership by Nixon and Kissinger. Fine. We deleted this since it was unacceptable as a term, although we do indeed want to exist and don't think anyone is casting doubt on that.

A new version of this emerged—and in fact it was the President himself who expressed the elements of the wording. Nonetheless, it has not appeared in that form in the final document, although serious statements are made in it. But they could be more serious and weighty.

If we had established that we should take as our basis political methods of resolving problems and not gamble on resolving them by military means, that certainly does not mean that troops and weapons would disappear overnight. No, just as nuclear weapons did not disappear when we established in Geneva the unacceptable nature of nuclear war. It is inadmissible. But that would be a very important political pointer both for Soviet-U.S. dialogue and for dialogue around the world.

We believed that this was a very important statement, especially since both leaders, both the leader of the Soviet Union and the leader of the United States, said this separately.

I think an opportunity to make a big stride in shaping civilized international relations has been missed. It did not prove possible to reach agreement on the subject of talks on conventional weapons in Europe. We were proposing to use the summit meeting—without, of

course, replacing the Vienna forum, but to make its work easier. For if it is a question of us, the Soviet Union and the Americans, coming to some kind of agreement, to some kind of understanding, especially on such an important question as the subject of the talks—and this is what is now holding up the process in Vienna—in order to give a mandate. [sentence as heard]

The position was conceived in Geneva at the meeting between Mr Shultz and USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Nevertheless, despite a positive attitude to it on both sides it did not get into the statements, apparently under the respectable pretext that it was inconvenient to usurp the dialogue in Vienna—although we were not planning to usurp it; on the contrary we wanted to make it easier, having come forward and said that this is our view, which the participants in the Vienna meeting can make use of.

This is what I think: There is so much talk about it being impossible to set in motion the process of nuclear disarmament—the 50 percent reduction—unless the problem of conventional weapons and the reduction of armaments in Europe is tackled. But as soon as we come out with realistic proposals in order to set this process in motion, these incomprehensible maneuverings start all over again—withdrawal, withdrawal.

When everyone was worried that the Warsaw Pact had the advantage in forces, we said: Let's compare, so everything is clear. The other side veered away from that. We have now made a proposal on the subject of the talks: let's speak out and say we have come to an understanding on the subject of the talks; that would make the work in Vienna easier. Again, it has not worked.

The Americans did not accept our bold and totally realistic plan in three stages and components for the elimination of asymmetries and imbalances in Europe and a decisive leap forward toward the creation on the continent of a situation of nonoffensive structure of armaments and armed forces, with a considerable reduction...at a reduced level.

I believe that a good opportunity has been missed to get things moving as required regarding the confrontation between the two most powerful alliances and thus to promote international security as a whole.

As I have been saying, what can you do? Politics is politics, the art of the possible. In any case I would not draw dramatic conclusions from the fact that it did not all succeed as it might have. But nonetheless I have to share with you my own reasonings in order that you might have a fuller understanding concerning the content of these talks.

Before I round off my talk, I would like to share with you one general impression. Were I not to mention this, I would not be completely honest and truthful with you if

I made no mention of this impression. I get this sort of impression—I would say an impression of the contradictory nature of the U.S. position. This is not just an observation on the basis of the outcome of this meeting. But this time we have again come up against this phenomenon.

So, what does this contradiction in the U.S. approach, the U.S. position, consist of? On the one hand, we have a joint statement to the effect that there must be no war, that it is unacceptable; we conduct a businesslike talk on disarmament and on arms reduction, and we speak of our preference for political solutions to problems. And yet, on the other hand we are forever hearing—and we heard it this time in Moscow, and on many occasions before President came here—about banking on strength. In his first speech at the Kremlin dinner he spoke about this: strength, realism, and some third element that I don't recall. But that means strength, that is armed strength and military might. It is proclaimed as the main principle of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union, and not just the Soviet Union.

How can the Geneva statement and this approach be reconciled? On the one hand, the President and I state that both our peoples want to live in peace and to cooperate, and even to be friends. Our people say that, and I have read the U.S. press where, in reply to the question of how they would like to see our relations in the year 2000, they even prefer rivalry [as heard] to friendly relations. I mean cooperation. [The TASS English version reads: "...relations in the year 2000, the Americans preferred development of friendly relations and cooperation to rivalry."] It would seem that we, entrusted as we have been by our peoples with full power, must work on the basis of this reality and this, the will of our peoples. In real politics this does not work.

For example, this is noticeable in respect to economic links, where it is clearly in the interests of an authoritative part of the U.S. business world to cooperate with us and to oppose the bans, restrictions, and sometimes simply intimidation. With regard to us, in the United States there is truly a regime of most unfavorable status in operation. Yesterday the President and I had a long talk on this theme. I said: Why should the living hold onto the coattails of the dead? I mean the Jackson-Vanik amendment. [The TASS English version of the preceding two sentences reads: "Why should the dead grip at the coattails of the living, referring to the Jackson-Vanik Amendment."] Well, one of them is dead and the other politically dead. Why should they hold us back? That was accepted in a completely different situation decades ago. Today, in this situation, in a completely different and changed world, we must think, while basing and building our policies on present-day realities.

This reminds me of English law, where today's illegal actions are judged on the basis of laws set down in 1200 or 1300 or whenever. Each has his own tradition, and I

do not condemn it. It is the affair of the English. I hope the British correspondents are not offended. But politics must operate on the basis of the realities of today, and must look to the future.

I said to the President: You know, we have already proven that economically we can live without each other, and now we have to prove that we can cooperate; especially if we are destined to have to cooperate. Otherwise, the alternative will lead to a completely unpredictable... [Gorbachev changes thought] in an unpredictable direction. And then it is impossible to have solid cooperation without this reliance on commercial and economic cooperation.

I would even risk posing the question in this way: the more economically dependent we are on each other, the more predictable we will be on a political level; on the level of politics. Don't you agree? You don't have to reply, just answer in your commentaries.

We see this contradiction in propaganda and in the behavior of officials in human rights matters. On the one hand we say: Yes, we are independent—each people possesses the right to a social choice, and relies on its own values. Yes, we are different. But this is not a matter for confrontation. It is especially not grounds for war. It is good that there is diversity. It is grounds for comparisons, a stimulus for thought, for consideration. It is interesting. And we can remain ourselves and yet live normally in this civilized world.

So far, we have not noted a serious desire to turn toward new phenomena, or to take into consideration changes in our society. Evidently whoever this... [Gorbachev changes thought] this is in someone's interest. Just as Mayakovskiy once said in our country, if—Nikolay Natveyevich, how did he put it—if the stars burn, it means that someone needs this. That is—in whose interest is it? It is in someone's interest. But I am certain that our peoples are of a different view, and this is the decisive factor in determining policy. This disappoints our people, this contradiction in the policy and behavior of the U.S. Administration.

All the same, returning to a general appraisal of the fourth Soviet-U.S. meeting I would like to say—a great event; the dialogue is continuing. The continuity has received additional momentum. Soviet-U.S. relations have advanced, I don't know, by one, or two levels, but in any event they have risen to a new level. And this in itself is a significant fact in international politics.

I have told you everything I can. Members of the delegation will reply to questions. I have done my part.

Gorbachev Answers Questions

LD0106164688 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1020 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Question and answer session at news conference by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev at the summit press center in Moscow—live; journalists' questions in English with superimposed Russian translation or in Russian]

[Text] [Journalist Kondrashov] Kondrashov of IZVESTIYA. Mikhail Sergeyevich, you and President Reagan have trodden a path which has been not easy but very fruitful, and one which has been hailed throughout the world. In 8 months the man who has traveled that path with you, President Reagan, will be leaving the White House. If you take a leap ahead and take a look ahead, do you envision the possibility of more or less regular summit level contacts with the next president? And do you, perhaps, envision the possibility of some kind of meeting to get to know one another soon after the next president takes office?

[Gorbachev] I not only envision the possibility, I consider this to be essential, vitally essential.

[Journalist Peterson in English] Barry Peterson from CBS news. In what you were saying a few minutes ago, you twice mentioned missed opportunities. You also said politics is the art of the possible. I would therefore like to ask you whether it is now still going to be possible, with this administration, to conclude a treaty on strategic offensive weapons, if the Americans are going to insist on keeping the SDI program going?

[Gorbachev] I am sure that the possibility still exists to achieve a treaty this year. In the first place, I am sustained in this optimism by the progress that has been achieved between Washington and Moscow during this period, and by the interchange that has been going on here almost around the clock. It is that which permits one to express such an optimistic assessment.

[Journalist (Politti) in English] (Politti) of IL MESSAGGERO. I would like to ask whether the President had anything to say about the United States' obligation toward the Geneva process concerning Afghanistan, after what you had to say.

[Gorbachev] It has become apparent to me that not only the President but all the members of the delegation appreciate the importance of a successful resolution of the Afghan conflict on the basis of the principles which were laid down at Geneva. But I think that the exchange which has been held on the subject—a frank exchange at that—has been useful.

[Journalist, name indistinct, in English; identified by Moscow TASS in English, which transmits a shorter version of the Gorbachev question and answer session at 0010 GMT on 2 June, as "National Public Radio, USA"] Mr General Secretary. Several times in the past few days you have been asked whether there will be a fifth summit meeting with President Reagan, maybe this fall, and as a rule you have replied: Yes, it is possible, but it all depends on how things go at this meeting. Well, now that this meeting is almost over, do you perceive enough progress to justify holding a fifth summit meeting with President Reagan in the fall of this year?

[Gorbachev] I link the possibility of holding such a meeting to just one question: Whether we are able to get a treaty on strategic offensive arms taking account of the whole complex.... I don't think I fully answered the American correspondent's question just now...taking account of the whole complex, including ABM, the ABM problem and sea-launched cruise missiles.... I shall not go into all the details. All of this comes into the sphere of the talks and the exchange of opinions. So, inasmuch as I can identify the possibility of getting a treaty, that is how I see the possibility of a fifth meeting. For the moment it remains a real one. I link the possibility of a fifth meeting to this matter alone.

[Unidentified speaker] It was explained to you that the microphones are in the seats signified with a white mark.

[Second unidentified speaker] Mr Gorbachev, excuse me for asking this question in English. [continues in English] All of us here have been struck....

[First unidentified speaker interrupts] Announce yourself please.

[Second unidentified speaker continues in English] I am Lars Eric Nelsson of the New York DAILY NEWS. [Interpreter continues in Russian] All of us have been surprised at the degree of openness which exists in your society. Yesterday, the Americans were even surprised by the tone of the speech by the U.S. President at Moscow State University. And thirdly, we were amazed that there was not a word about this speech yesterday in the Soviet press. It would be interesting to know what is your reaction to this speech?

[Gorbachev] You know, unfortunately, I have not been able to acquaint myself with all the speeches by the President—at the meeting with the writers and at the meeting in Moscow State University, inasmuch as we have lacked time here, which, properly speaking, happens. All the same I think that these meetings were useful. At least, those comrades who are in touch with these meetings have told me that in general they were useful meetings. So far as our press is concerned, well, they are present here and if they haven't yet managed to write something, I think that they will try to write something.

[Unidentified voice] VOSTOK [words indistinct]

[Unidentified voice] There is a big article in the KOMOSOMOLKA [KOMOSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] about... [words indistinct due to cross-talk]

[Journalist Mattar] SANA news agency, Syria. Hamza Mattar. Mikhail Sergeyevich, Arab countries give a high appraisal of your recent words with regards to the Palestinian people who are these very days conducting a courageous struggle against the Israeli occupiers. Please

say what has been achieved in your meetings with Mr Reagan on the Palestinian question and on a Near East settlement in general. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] We concluded that real factors have emerged relating to a political settlement of the situation in the Near East. But first of all, there is an understanding in the world community, including among the members of the Security Council, the permanent members, of the need to do this, all the same, within the framework of an international conference. It is another matter that the question of the content of this has not yet been clarified.

Then there is the understanding that there are the interests of Syria, there are the interests of the Palestinian people, there are the interests of Israel, and there are the interests of other countries which are being involved in this region and this conflict. For this reason, we are in favor of doing all this on the basis of a political settlement, on the basis of taking account of the interests of all the sides involved. And of course, there are fundamental things which have been affirmed in the relevant resolutions. The issue is that all the lands occupied by Israel should be returned. The issue is that the right of the Palestinian people should be restored.

We told the President that we.... I think that we also imagine the role of the United States in the same way.... We can't take decisions for the Arabs on how the Palestinians will take part in an international conference on this. Let them decide themselves, the Arabs. And we, both the Americans and the Soviet Union, have to show respect. After all, there is an enormous Arab world.

Furthermore, we should recognize Israel's right to security. We should recognize the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. In what form? Let the Palestinians, together with their friends the Arabs, resolve it themselves.

In my view, this opens up opportunities for a vigorous exchange, for a real process. In any case, it seems to me that, all the same, a stage of real exchange is appearing, that we have, as it were, entered into a real process.

We, I even, shall enlighten you on another matter. We said that when the conference begins—and it will not simply be an umbrella for separate talks, but a normal conference, an effective forum which would be interconnected with bilateral, trilateral, and all manner of other forums of examining these problems—well, as soon as this conference begins its work, we are ready to tackle the question of normalizing diplomatic relations with Israel.

So that we are, so to speak, introducing a further new element. And this indicates that we are standing firmly on the soil of reality, on the soil of recognizing the balance of interests. But of course, there are also the major questions of returning the lands, there is the right of the self-determination of the Palestinian people, and I think that—and we should say this again—that we

proceed from the position that both the Israeli people and the State of Israel has a right to its own security. Because there can be no security of one at the expense of the other. A solution must be found which would untie this very tight knot.

[Journalist Lozinski] Lozinski, TRYBUNA LUDU, Poland. Comrade General Secretary, this morning in the Kremlin you said that the issue of France, especially the issue of conventional weapons in Europe, would be considered today. Just now you said that the West was turning down the Soviet proposal. We know your proposal and we know that it also includes the views and proposals of other socialist countries, including Poland. And another thing is that you can turn it down, but the problem is not going to disappear. How do you see this European issue in the future? What might happen after Vienna? What can we expect? What can we expect, since this program of yours also answers to some extent the wishes of even some Western countries, even the German Social Democratic Party, and others, even neutral countries. Could you tell us, please, how do you see the future? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] In order to be completely objective I have to say that the American side does not turn down....

[Shevardnadze interrupts, whispering] Does not completely (?turn down.)

[Gorbachev continues] ...turn down an examination of the issue of the subject of negotiations on the basis of accords, which were reached in Geneva at a meeting between our foreign affairs ministers. They have only backed away from making a statement on it, from registering our understanding at the highest level in Moscow as to how we interpret this process. Therefore I have to be absolutely objective in order not to cast aspersions at the American side when it is a question of such major issues. And their argument was that they had to consult. Well, we considered that that was a process which was not inconsistent—well, one has to consult—and I think that they did consult. Presumably they cannot agree on something. Nevertheless, I think that prospects for reaching a mandate at the Vienna conference are realistic, realistic.

I have to say that the issue of the mandate, of the subject of the negotiations—well, of the mandate—was to some extent being linked by the U.S. side to the issue, the Vienna issue, of Helsinki. It is in particular things relating to the humanitarian field. Well, I think that the process there too is proceeding vigorously and actively. Clashes of views, juxtapositions are taking place there. I think that all these are living processes and that solutions are possible. That's what I think.

The prospect is realistic, and we think that the Soviet Union in its foreign policy should always take into consideration the opinion of Europe, equally East and West Europe. And that's how we are trying to conduct

matters with our allies. This is especially being done now. We are having regular exchanges regarding these issues. And we are also trying to conduct matters with the West European countries, so that there is always full clarity and understanding here. We want to build our common European house together.

[Gerasimov] I would like to give the floor to an Englishman; please go ahead, Martin [as heard].

[McCarthy] Mr General Secretary, (Jim McCarthy). There is the widespread opinion that the differences between the U.S. SDI program and yours are one of the major obstacles along the road to concluding a treaty on strategic offensive weapons. Have you managed to make any progress in the matter of eliminating the differences in regard of the SDI program during this summit meeting, and if so, precisely what progress has been made in this respect? Do you continue to believe that that continues to remain the major obstacle along the road to concluding a START Treaty?

[Gorbachev] I do—I am answering the last question—I do believe so, because it means destabilization, and it does not fit in with normal logic: to reduce strategic offensive weapons on earth and to build a bridge for an arms race in space, although the U.S. side keeps trying to convince us that it is merely defensive weaponry. We do not think so, and we are competent to express opinions. It is simply fraught with a most serious destabilization of the whole situation in the world, if the arms race is transferred.

Furthermore, I told the President: You and I established in Geneva that we are not striving and that we will not strive for military superiority. But, I would like to stress, you have formed the view—at least you have been convinced so—that you have an opportunity to get ahead, to overtake us through space, to achieve superiority. And thus you are pulling back from that which was established in Geneva. But apart from that, you are being nudged in a very wrong direction and you should stop. We had a very sharp discussion about the philosophy of this, let's say, defensive system.

There was also one more aspect, that the U.S. side, in order to convince us that we should support SDI, is ready, when it reaches some real yields in that field, is ready to share secrets with us. Then I told the President: Mr President, allow me to disagree with you and express doubts about this reassurance. Why? Right now we just cannot agree how to monitor [kontrolirovat] the presence of sea-launched missiles aboard two or three types of ships, because you are not ready for it and you just will not agree. So how can we agree that you are suddenly going to unveil all the secrets of SDI? This is not serious. This lies outside real politics. There you are.

Nevertheless, having had this philosophical discussion, at this kind of military-strategic level, we returned to Washington and agreed, after all, to act on the basis of

the Washington declaration, especially as there are several such concrete things in it. I could even illustrate this for you that here too progress can be made in this and that. [at this point Gorbachev reads from document] The Soviet side is in favor of strict observance of the ABM Treaty and undertakes not to abandon it during an agreement period. In consideration of the position of the U.S. side, it has put forward a compromise solution to the issues on which there are differences. In particular, we proposed to realize the following:

1. Exchange of data relating to work in the field of SDI; meetings between experts; reciprocal visits to experimental grounds where the final work and experiments in that field take place.
2. Exchange of information for the purpose of preventing and eliminating grey areas from the point of view of the observance of undertakings adopted by the parties.
3. Monitoring [kontrol] of the observance of fulfillment of undertakings, right up to inspection of facilities, which arouse the concern of the parties.
4. Holding of consultations to consider and amplify situations, which, in the view of one of the parties, would put its supreme interests in jeopardy. In the course of the consultations the parties shall make use of all available measures in order to settle the situation on a mutually-acceptable basis.

So, as you can see, quite a lot of effort will be required to complete the preparation of an agreement on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive weapons in 1988, but we remain convinced that it is possible. And these are our proposals. I do not think I have ever answered such questions more fully.

[Journalist Walker] Martin Walker, THE GUARDIAN. There are 5,000 journalists present here in the framework of the summit meeting. The internal policy of the Soviet Union has suddenly become rather unusual in the sense that Yeltsin, in a television interview, suddenly calls for the resignation of Mr Ligachev. Fedor Burlatskiy, Tatyana Zaslavskaya, and Afanasyev have suddenly started talking about difficulties which they have been encountering in the course of election of delegates for the forthcoming party conference. You call for supporters of restructuring to be participants and delegates. But now only some manifestations of symbols of this restructuring are in evidence. How do you, personally, assess the process of political restructuring in the Soviet Union as the party conference draws closer, and what do you think about Mr Yeltsin's call regarding the resignation of Mr Ligachev?

[Gorbachev] My assessment of the progress of restructuring and its prospects is completely identical with the theses of the CPSU Central Committee on this question. The basic drafts of these theses are sitting in front of you, after all, but of course the entire Politburo and the entire

leadership has participated. This is an expression of our collective opinion, regarding the platform of the forthcoming party conference and the prospects of the restructuring.

I think that the conference will give a second, powerful, wind to the entire process of restructuring in all the main directions. We will act resolutely but also circumspectly. An enormous country and an enormous responsibility: we cannot put ourselves, our friends, even the world community in a complex situation. Our people are changing in the course of gaining experiences, their own specific experience of restructuring, you know, as we ourselves are. Because we have started from the same situation, we have given a meaning to the situation, have drawn lessons from it, have drawn up plans, and we are looking for paths. In general we have found them, but there are many tactical problems, many practical problems. It is not always going successfully, maybe. We do not always find a precise solution to some questions. There may be disruption.

But as for the main thing: the restructuring is gathering pace. People are in favor of restructuring; society has been mobilized; the party and society are being renewed; all spheres of society are in the process of renewal. And now you can find in our society facts for the illustration of any topic, any task which publishers of your newspaper, or anything, entrust you with. Any task you are set you can confirm by specific facts. This is not the issue. It is necessary to see the trend, phenomena in a general form, their trend, their prospects and facts, you know. By the way, even at this meeting here there have been attempts to cite facts sometimes, individual facts, a fact is a fact.

Next: I was asked a question yesterday, but I was quite unaware of the existence of an interview granted by Comrade Yeltsin to the BBC and also ABC, I think, yes?

[Gerasimov] BBC and ABC. Both, yes, but one after the other. In the second interview....

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Yes, so. I had to say yesterday that I knew nothing. This does not make me look good, but you probably did not try very hard to see that I knew in good time. What should I say? I told them to give me the precise texts of what Comrade Yeltsin had said. I want to peruse them. I do not yet have them. If the correspondents who conducted the interview can share with me the full recording, without editing, I will be grateful. Then we plan to have a talk with Comrade Yeltsin, because he is a member of the CPSU Central Committee; because what he says and what he is talking about were the subject of debate at the October plenum last year. Some 27 people spoke. And, just like you ask questions, his speech just happened. His speech was absolutely—how shall I put it?—it was not planned. We had a lively exchange on what report to present at the

70th anniversary [of the Great October Socialist Revolution], he spoke and an exchange of views started. Some 27 people spoke, 27, I believe.

[Unidentified speaker] Twenty-seven, yes.

[Gorbachev] And the view of all 27 was unanimous: The generalizations and conclusions of Comrade Yeltsin concerning various aspects of the activity of the Central Committee, the situation in the Politburo, the activity of the Secretariat, were incorrect. His speech was acknowledged to be politically erroneous. So a debate took place. A decision was adopted.

In the given case, the issue is that Comrade Yeltsin does not agree with decisions of the party Central Committee. So we have to question Comrade Yeltsin in the Central Committee and we will demand an explanation on what this is all about and what Comrade Yeltsin is after. His opinion, that is, differs from the opinion of the party Central Committee. This is the first thing.

As for Comrade Ligachev and his resignation, there is no such problem in the party Central Committee, or in the Politburo. This is all, and you can take it from here. And that's the way it will be.

[Unidentified speaker] (?Institute of the USA of the USSR Academy of Sciences) [The TASS English version gives the speaker's affiliation as: "the Soviet magazine 'USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY'"] Not only journalists have come here but also politologists who consider themselves to be experts on the U.S. scene. But no matter who you talk to now, everybody says that the conservative forces which tried to wreck ratification of the treaty are now consolidating, taking the view that the process of developing relations between the USSR and the United States is going too quickly, and they will take all steps to wreck this movement or reverse it regardless of the future administration. So it would be interesting to know whether there was talk of this with Reagan and what you think about these forces.

[Gorbachev] Not only I myself but also the rest of our leadership do not hold this opinion, that that is how things are. At my last meeting with the mass media I tried to discuss the phenomenon of conservatism quite broadly.

[Yakovlev interrupts] It is the United States which is trying to wreck things. The United States.

[Gorbachev] Eh?

[Yakovlev] It is the United States which is trying to wreck, to slow down the process [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] Oh, I see. We are not talking about our conservatives but American ones. [laughs] I remember speaking in our embassy to intellectuals and representatives of science, writers and people from the cultural

sphere, I approached the theme of convergence and said: Well, you know, let us just remain ourselves, have exchanges and look, and maybe that is useful. Mr Galbraith, whom I respect very much and with whose works I am well acquainted, got up and said: Why do you take such a very critical view of convergence? Yes, indeed. He said: You have bureaucrats and we have bureaucrats. We have much in common. You have conservatives and we have conservatives. [laughs]

Apart from the big difference which exists between our societies there are also things which can be compared. I think you should ask Mr President that question. He will be facing you soon.

[Gerasimov interrupts] He will be back home.

[Gorbachev] Eh?

[Gerasimov] He will be at home.

[Gorbachev] Yes, over there. And he will, in my view, give you a better answer. In any case, the opinion of conservatives in the United States will exert little influence on us.

[Unidentified speaker in English] General Secretary, let me give you an opportunity to talk about your conservatives. Analysis in the United States and also in your country indicates that you have only 3-5 years to secure success for restructuring. If you do not succeed in doing that then you will be overtaken by the conservatives and critics within the CPSU. Please can you give us your personal assessment as to what indications there are in this area, in the sense of ensuring success for restructuring which is necessary for this great society of yours to survive.

[Gorbachev] Let me put it this way. The main thing in our restructuring is that through democracy and glasnost we have already gotten the people involved, and through perfecting our political system we shall solidly strengthen this tendency. And I am sure that our people have understood this, perhaps with a few exceptions, who have not quite understood a few things. And some people perhaps judge restructuring only on the basis of whether or not things have changed in a certain village or town or enterprise. Perhaps there are some places which have not yet been reached by restructuring, which the processes have not touched. But you know, it is present everywhere now. What a debate there was recently on Sakhalin which ended up with a plenum of the party obkom being assembled, and they discussed the opinions of working people and Communists. This plenum recognized as just the remarks and demands of the working people, and recognized the need to strengthen the party leadership, and adopted measures and decisions which are necessary to ensure that the process of democratization should gather strength on Sakhalin. So that means

that restructuring has reached Sakhalin. That is, speaking in terms of breadth of spread. It also goes to the depths of things and penetrates all spheres.

I am sure that in 3 years nobody has proposed a convincing alternative policy, an alternative to restructuring. Nobody. And I am sure that there is no alternative. We must restructure and renew on the basis of our principles, on the basis of our ideals, and making use of the huge material, spiritual, and intellectual potential of our society. We are strong enough, the party is strong enough, and the people are strong enough to sustain restructuring and to put on a spurt.

So there is no alternative to restructuring. Restructuring will win. It may suffer certain deviations and maneuvers. There may even be breakdowns in places. But that does not change, and will not change, the main direction for the development of our society. We have set off along the path of irreversible changes as far as restructuring is concerned.

[Unidentified speaker in English] The Portuguese news agency. [The TASS English version identifies the speaker as from the Portuguese newspaper DIARIO DE NOTICIAS"] I would like to ask you this: Could you say something, first of all, about Angola? And, secondly, you have said more than once that we have lost—missed—lost....

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Missed—We have missed rather than lost. Lost implies forever, but missed at this meeting, but we still have the opportunity of taking advantage of the chance at future meetings.

As far as Angola is concerned, I have to say there was an interesting, meaningful, and realistic exchange of opinions. And the possibility was expressed from both our side and from the U.S. side of moving toward a settlement of this regional conflict. At the same time it was stressed from both sides that by keeping strictly to the well-known resolutions of the United Nations [turns to a colleague for guidance] Security Council, wasn't it? [colleague agrees] Security Council, and in order—eliminating the Republic of South Africa's interference in Angola's affairs—to grant independence to Namibia. For our part, we who are indirect participants in this process, have supported the process of the talks which are taking place between the Angolans, the Cubans, the Republic of South Africa, and with the mediation of the United States. If all the participants in this process consider that the Soviet Union should somehow involve itself more specifically, apart from expressing its opinions, we are ready to do so. In any event, there has been a conversation based on the understanding that this process could lead to a long-term positive result.

[Journalist Sturua] Sturua, IZVESTIYA. First, I would like to say that our paper today published quite a detailed report on President Reagan's speeches both in the House of Writers and at Moscow State University.

That is for the benefit of my American colleagues. And now, my question to you: Those of us who have been following the U.S.-Soviet dialogue have always felt that in the first period the difficulties that there were in the field of verification [kontrol] and inspection arose from our side. It now seems to us that the stress has shifted and fallen on to the U.S. side. How has the present summit meeting confirmed the existing of this shifting of stress?

[Gorbachev] Your observations are correct. And we have been talking about this, basing ourselves on the facts. It turned out that there was a lot of bluff in past statements, and now that we have gotten down to real processes, we are very determined that verification [kontrol] must be verification, real and effective verification. But, nevertheless, I have to say it so that my sharp words should not spoil your impression, should not affect your impression, about how things really have been. Still, in the sphere of verification, I believe that, thanks to the experience we have gained on the basis of working out the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, we are now working together in a constructive way. So we believe that solutions will be found, will be found on these questions, too.

[Unidentified correspondent] The Italian L'UNITA newspaper. Comrade Gorbachev, I quote President Reagan: Born, not hurried. Nevertheless, we are seeing a decisive turn for the better in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Here is my question: What has been Europe's role in this process, and what do you propose today so that Europe can join in this process more actively?

[Gorbachev] So far, Europe has not only been present but has taken an active part in all processes, in shaping all the problems which have been discussed at the summit meeting between the President of the United States and the general secretary. That is how it has been, and that is how we have acted with our allies in Eastern Europe. So, Europe—both Eastern and Western—has always been present and taken an active part and made its contribution, and we—I believe—will continue to do so, and I know that that is at least how the President was speaking. I would also like to say this: Today, when the world is seeking answers to burning questions—and very difficult questions, too—Europe has at its disposal unique experience—historic, intellectual, diplomatic, and political—and without Europe's contribution, I cannot visualize a successful solution to international problems.

[Chakovskiy] Chakovskiy, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. In the latest issue of our paper we published a note, a small piece, from our American correspondent, Ion Andronov, concerning the 300 Soviet servicemen in Afghanistan who have found themselves, that is, were forcibly removed to the territory of Pakistan. Following this, letters have arrived at the editor's office asking about the fate of these 300 people. I will venture to ask

whether, in talking about regional and all sorts of other conflicts, this question was raised during your conversation with Reagan, esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich?

[Gorbachev] I will tell you, in addition to what you have said, Aleksandr Borisovich, that I too have received letters from several mothers. This allows us, allowed us to make contact with the U.S. side in order to examine these questions at a practical level, and such discussions will be held. On the specific level the President and I did not discuss the matter, but it has started to be worked on at a working level, at an expert level.

[Shevardnadze] And with the Pakistanis too.

[Gorbachev] Yes, indeed, I should add. Eduard Amvroseyevich rightly adds that this problem has also been put to Pakistan. We will do everything we can in order to get our people back home.

[[Eaton]] (William Eaton), LOS ANGELES TIMES. As you know, in the United States every 4 years there are elections for president, whether they are needed or not, it doesn't matter. But the president is restricted to a term of 8 years in office. Your term in office of general secretary is not quite so precisely determined. Many Americans would like to know how long you intend to stay in office now.

[Gorbachev] It does not depend on my intentions, although your ideas about our democracy are such that you imagine the people supposedly have nothing to do with it. This is yet another instance showing that we do not have true impressions of each other. Nevertheless, I will reply to your question. Clarity will be put into this problem at the party conference, taking account of what has already been said briefly in the theses, and it will apply both to party and to other organs which are elected. And it will be reflected in a new law on the electoral system. So these questions will be placed on a legal basis.

[Unidentified correspondent] RIZOSPASTIS, Greece. Mikhail Sergeyevich, in your introductory speech you mentioned a number of regional conflicts, but you did not refer to southern Europe, the Mediterranean, the Cyprus problem. Does that mean that those questions were not dealt with at the talks, or were disagreements so great that there was no progress? Lastly, do you intend to visit Greece this year?

[Gorbachev] On the first question I will tell you this. During intensive exchanges of views in the working groups our side raised those problems. But they were not developed in view of the lack of interest displayed on the U.S. side.

As for my visits, we are planning them, and as soon as it becomes clear, we shall without fail take up the invitation in order to make a visit.

[Gerasimov] Japan has the floor.

[Unidentified Correspondent] Japanese Television. Apart from Cambodia and Afghanistan, what other regional problems in Asia did you discuss with President Reagan? Did you discuss questions of the Korean Peninsula in connection with the forthcoming Olympic games?

[Gorbachev] Yes, we spoke about Afghanistan, as I have already said. We spoke about Cambodia. And we spoke about the position on the Korean peninsula. It seems—I got the impression, we did not have the time to exchange views, and we spoke about it today—that the U.S. side has an understanding that there needs to be some movement there. But they expressed, negatively described the standpoint of North Korea. We, on the contrary, presented the President with the standpoint of the Government of North Korea as being constructive and inviting dialogue.

What is more, they are ready both on a bilateral basis and with the participation of the Americans to lead an exchange of views on the situation and on the prospects for unification, on the principles on whose basis a unification of the nation must take place. So we did discuss the question. And we advocated that there are possibilities right there which have not yet been utilized.

[Correspondent (Ravi Daderwan)] (Ravi Daderwan) AL-HAWADITH magazine. You said earlier that there was a coming together of standpoints during this summit meeting on the question of the Near East. Could you not tell us in more detail how precisely the standpoints of the United States and USSR coincide on these questions? And will Mr Shultz be taking away with him some sort of joint standpoint during his trip to that region? And secondly, there is some uncertainty in relation to the fact that yesterday Mr Reagan said nothing about the Near East when speaking to the students at Moscow University. Today you said nothing about the question of the situation in the Persian Gulf region. Today you said that Afghanistan can be used as an example for settling a similar situation in Cambodia and other places. Could you not be more specific on this question?

[Gorbachev] On the Near East I would like to repeat once again that there are elements which allow us to precisely note a coming together of positions. Firstly, a recognition of the fact that a conference is necessary. That is very important—an international conference. Such an understanding exists. Secondly, there is an understanding that within the framework of such a conference there could be other forums set in motion. And we are in agreement with that. There is an understanding that the requirements of the appropriate resolutions on that score must be put into effect.

I think that there are, nevertheless, aspects which will need working on—the substance, the meaningfulness of the conference, after all, and also the question of Palestine, of the participation of the PLO in talks on the process. That is what is needed. I can also say—I spoke of it earlier, and I want to say now—that there is finally an understanding by the United States that the Soviet Union must participate in the settlement. We gave the Americans the possibility for several years of working on it themselves. They worked on it, and saw that nothing was coming of it. When they became convinced and our dialogue resumed, something is happening. We are ready to cooperate constructively.

As for the second part of your question on the Persian Gulf. That question was discussed fairly thoroughly after Afghanistan. We hold the view that the conflict is very serious. Everything must be done to stop it developing on such a grave level. Such a military mass is concentrated there now that it must be stopped from coming together in a dangerous direction. Therefore, we say that we favor exploiting to the full the potential laid down in the first resolution of the Security Council in order to give the opportunity to the secretary general or his representatives to put it into practice, in order to achieve a cessation of actions, the creation of a commission and its work to establish the causes and so forth. I think we are right to call for restraint, for a display of self-control. And although we are adherents of the view that the conflict must be resolved, because the threat of its growth with dangerous consequences is a real one, we are calling on the Americans, saying: Let us unload the Persian Gulf as far as your military presence is concerned, and it would be better to bring in UN forces in order not to push the process in the wrong direction, a dangerous direction. So we spoke in detail.

[Unidentified correspondent] THE WASHINGTON POST. I would like to ask you to clarify the following two points which you made to us today.

First, concerning the Soviet proposals on space. You have read them to us. Could you specify: Was the U.S. reaction such as to give you grounds for believing that there are certain opportunities directed at resolving the space problem, even if they did not immediately accept your offer today?

And second, concerning conventional armaments. If I understood what you said, do you mean that the accord to draw up a mandate was practically reached in Geneva? That is news to us. We did not know that you were on the eve of concluding such an agreement. Could you specify what you meant when you spoke of drawing up an international mandate in respect of the talks on conventional armaments, and what is the status of these talks at the moment?

[Gorbachev] I will not, after all, go into detail on the first question. Our joint statement contains an entry confirming the Washington statement and recognition of the

need for intensive work in the sphere on the basis of the two U.S. proposals, on sensor equipment and on the basis of our proposals. So, there are also some specifics which the negotiators and experts should discuss in detail. That is the first thing.

Second, I am always in favor of making statements precise. Perhaps it was I who was not precise. But I am not a diplomat, after all.

In Geneva the exchange of stances took place on the issues of the Vienna meeting, on the mandate of that conference, and in particular, we approached the question of the subject of the talks there, since other things had been determined. And as far as the fact of reaching mutual understanding of our two sides, precisely of ours, the U.S. and the Soviet ones is concerned, there was a formula which was brought there by Comrade Shevardnadze, which I made public at that summit. And Mr Shultz confirmed that it was really so. That formula was handed to the negotiators in Vienna, but that process there was not completed. And here it was again subject of a very thorough study, but that work has not been completed for certain reasons which I have dwelled upon.

[Unidentified correspondent; identified in TASS English version as from "THE NEW YORK TIMES"] Mr General Secretary, when you were in Washington you told Mr Reagan that the Soviet Union was ready to halt the supply of arms to Nicaragua if the United States stopped funding the contras. Then later Mr Shevardnadze and Shultz discussed this matter, and we were told that the Soviet position had not changed in this respect, that is, if the United States stopped supplies to Central America then the Soviet Union would halt supplies to Nicaragua. Could you confirm that such a change in position is correct? And what did you discuss in this respect within the context of discussing Central American?

[Gorbachev] Today, we discussed this matter in great detail, this problem in detail. Furthermore, with an excursion into history. And whenever we digress we have different points of view and explanations. All the same, I proposed starting off from the realities of today. There is the Contadora process; there are the Guatemala agreements; there is a cease-fire; there is a movement toward seeking a political settlement. And while relying on this process we must support it. Let the opposing forces in Nicaragua themselves, with the participation of the Latin Americans and the representatives of Central America, resolve this matter.

I told the President that I reaffirm what was said during walks in the White House, that is, let us restrict ourselves to supplying weapons for the police. Generally speaking, then, this theme will be further developed, and we have called on the Americans now to be attentive to the fact that this process has reached the stage when it could be concluded effectively, I mean positively.

There is some Somoist army colonel who has surfaced. He served Somoza well, and now he serves the United States. But he is doing a great deal to derail this process. Well, I don't know, maybe the colonel should be replaced by a sergeant, and then he would be closer to the people and will do something a good more rapidly.

[Borovik] Mikhail Sergeyevich, this is Borovik of Soviet Television and the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace. If we are to speak of the foreign policy aspects of restructuring, then restructuring has extended far to the east of Sakhalin and far to the west of Brest. In particular, I mean the enormous attention paid by the public, and just by ordinary people, to what is going on, and the desire to penetrate the holy of holies of this. Hundreds of people have come to Moscow from the antiwar organizations of the whole world to follow the talks. And I know that tomorrow you are having a meeting with public and antiwar organizations. But since today there are such a number of correspondents, and maybe also since they may be listening to the press conference, of course, your opinion, please, about the role of the public and people's diplomacy in the whole process that has been going on over the past 3 years.

[Gorbachev] Generally speaking, I have spoken about this on several occasions. But to summarise, I can say today that I believe we would be making a great political blunder if we were not to pay attention to the very profound changes in the mood of the world public, the people of the world. People are weary of war, or, at any rate, at least, of tension and conflict, of being swamped by information that spoils their day today and promises even worse for the morrow. And people have started to feel that their will, their word, their wishes, their desires, or their interests are not always reflected in real politics. And they have started to do something about it, joining the appropriate organizations and mobilizing all they have at their disposal, so to speak. And we see ordinary people, the intelligentsia, doctors, scientists, former servicemen, veterans, and so on, young people, and children. I think all this is in great earnest.

If anyone thinks someone has a hand in this, then I should like to shake that hand, for it is a mighty hand that has been brought to the movement. It is something else that is at work here, I believe.

The world feels that change is necessary, because life itself has raised such questions, that people are starting to intervene directly in real politics. And so politics that are impregnated with the experience of the masses and with their mood and their will, politics that are enriched with the competence of scientists, politics that are enriched with morality, with the contribution that the intelligentsia and representatives of the culture front can make to it—these are politics that I believe have a future, that alone can exist today, and that have the right to life, for they correspond totally to the real processes that have started developing.

So, in general, I am prepared to go with them along the streets and wander through towns. True, in that case my pay would be cut!

[Correspondent (Williams)] (Carol Williams), ASSOCIATED PRESS. Mr General Secretary, would you agree with the assessment that U.S.-Soviet relations are above the period of detente [as heard] when attention was focused basically on economic cooperation and political tolerance? To what extent, in your opinion, can and must the two superpowers be mutually dependent from the economic point of view?

[Gorbachev] You know, I think about today's reality, tomorrow's reality. If one analyzes them seriously, one concludes generally that we have to cooperate. And this would be both in the interest of our peoples and in the interest of the whole world. I myself visualize a future, all the same—I talked about this yesterday—in my opinion, a future world in which American and Soviet people cooperate, including in the sphere of economy, exchanging the fruits of their labor, supplementing each other. And this is why the idea was born for the joint flight to Mars, in order to compete and not to race each other in arms, but to combine our potentials, both scientific, economic, and intellectual, and to give an example of cooperation in this direction. This would move the whole process forward very much, not to mention the fact that this would develop the framework of cooperation and would assist the strengthening of trust between our people. Yesterday—and let me say that I used methods which are out of order, since this was in public, in the view of the people—I pressed the President a bit on these questions and he said: Yes, we will give it a thought. And in my opinion, I can say today that in this weighty and big statement there are ideas to start the study of this problem.

Well, I would like to say goodbye to you. You have to preserve your strength—both yours and mine and save some for the President—or you will exhaust yourselves. [laughter in the background] Thank you for the active participation, I see how many hands are raised and ask you to excuse me if I have not been able, perhaps, to answer everything. But I welcome this huge active interest in the fourth summit meeting here in Moscow and thank you for your cooperation. Goodbye. [applause] [The TASS English version adds the following concluding paragraph: "The press conference was attended by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Dmitriy Yazov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of defence of the USSR, Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Anatoliy Chernyayev, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee."]

Reagan News Conference

LD0106220588 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1930 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Special program: "News Conference of U.S. President R. Reagan"; held at Spaso House in Moscow on 1 June—recorded; Reagan's remarks in English with superimposed Russian translation; correspondents' questions in Russian or in English with superimposed Russian translation; correspondents identified where possible]

[Text] [Unidentified speaker] Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States of America! [video: seated audience stands; Reagan enters the back of the hall and walks forward toward the rostrum; he salutes and then mounts the rostrum]

[Reagan] Please be seated. I will be making a statement.

Now that I have the opportunity to address all of you, I should like to express my gratitude to General Secretary Gorbachev and all of his colleagues in the Soviet Government and also to the inhabitants of Moscow for all that they have done to see that our stay here has been pleasant and the summit meeting successful.

This is my fourth meeting with the Soviet leadership. Some members of my government and your representatives of the press have had more frequent meetings with the Soviet leadership. The present meeting is notable for the fact that very useful work has been accomplished at it, and the excellent relations between Mr Gorbachev and myself and also between many members of our government delegations have been further developed and deepened. However, personal relationships and general hopes for peace are in themselves still not enough. I think that history will confirm the fact that the United States has striven to see that during a summit meeting, its intentions and goals have been expressed consistently and in full. However the circumstances have taken shape, I have endeavored to emphasize our all-embracing striving for peace. I have always endeavored to note the existing fundamental differences. This is why I feel great satisfaction at the fact that, as a result of the present meeting, the differences have been albeit partially smoothed out.

Moreover, the representatives of the Soviet Government have admitted that there have been serious changes in their policy. The United States is fully up to date on these changes and realizes their consequences. Therefore when I note the differences that still separate us, I am doing so not out of a wish to sound a pessimistic note, but indeed to sound a note of realism, and not to give a lesson but to give testimony for the benefit of truth, which in the final analysis removes illusions and moves negotiations forward. From our standpoint this approach has yielded fruit at previous meetings as well as at the present summit meeting.

Permit me for a minute to go back to our first meeting in Geneva. There we agreed on the concrete and fundamental realities that should determine our relations, namely, that nuclear war cannot be won and therefore it ought never to be waged, that the United States and the Soviet Union bear particular responsibility for averting war, and that neither side should strive for military superiority over the other. We confirmed our determination to avert war, whether nuclear or conventional, and also our determination with all our strength and together with other countries to promote the creation of a more secure world. We also worked out a broader agenda and initiated a new dialogue aimed at revealing sources of tension in Soviet-U.S. relations. Since the times of Geneva we have by means of unceasing efforts achieved progress on many items in this broad agenda.

Our first discussions here in Moscow were focused on important questions relating to human rights and individual liberties. The United States regards human rights as fundamental in our relations with the Soviet Union and all other countries. We stressed this aspect right from the very outset. We are now heartened by recent signs of progress in this field in the USSR. I consider that where people have the right to freely speak, travel and believe, enormous creative energy is released. I have said repeatedly that people do not mistrust each other because they are armed, but they are armed because they do not trust each other.

For the past 3 years, General Secretary Gorbachev and I have been working together to build our relations on the basis of more trust. We both recognize that one of the ways to achieve this is an improvement in mutual understanding between our countries through broader contacts between people. A whole number of agreements directed at expanding American-Soviet international cooperation, including cultural exchanges, have been concluded. We agreed to expand our student exchange programs to give hundreds and, in the future, thousands of Soviet and U.S. students the opportunity to study together. For our future mutual relations, scientific, cultural and other exchanges are of enormous significance.

In considering regional conflicts, Mr Gorbachev and I agreed that they ought to be resolved only by peaceful means. Our aim is to promote the development of independence, security, and freedom. The Soviet decision to leave Afghanistan is very important. We agreed that the Afghan settlement can serve as a basis for an approach to other regional problems. In our discussions we also discussed the Cambodian question, the situation in Angola, Ethiopia, the Near East, the Persian Gulf, and Central America.

Every one of our summit meetings took us closer and closer to the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Today we exchanged documents of ratification, which now turns that treaty into a reality. Every meeting has also taken us closer and closer to the adoption of an

even more serious aim: the working out of a treaty on reducing our strategic nuclear arsenals. In Geneva the general secretary and I agreed on the concept of a 50-percent reduction; in Reykjavik, on quantitative ceilings for nuclear warheads and means of delivery; in Washington, on intense work to prepare a treaty on strategic offensive weapons, including comprehensive measures for verification [proverka], based on the principles of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Here in Moscow, we have taken important and additional steps in that direction. Verification measures are one of the most important and most complicated problems in our discussions, and it is pleasant for me to report to you about progress in that sphere too. We have moved forward in other directions also, including agreement on an experiment on improving verification measures over the fulfillment of existing treaties on limiting nuclear tests and on notification about launches of strategic ballistic missiles.

And finally, permit me to say that I was deeply moved by conversations with various citizens of the Soviet Union. The monks of the Danilov Monastery, dissidents, refuseniks, writers and artists, students, and young people proved to me that in this country spiritual values are treasured. I hope sincerely that these values will obtain even greater expression.

And now I will be happy to answer your questions. Helen, we'll start with you.

[Helen] Mr President, at your first press conference in 1981 you said that the Soviets deceive, cheat and strive for world dominance. What has changed your attitude to them? Can the U.S. people trust the Russians now?

[Reagan] Helen, that was the very first press conference upon my being elected President. The question which you asked me consisted of the following: Can we trust the Russians, and will they deceive us? My answer at that time reflected not my view. I said that I will answer the question with quotations, and I quoted some of the leaders of the communist movement and of the Soviet Union, and that there was nothing amoral in deception, in cheating, or in anything of the kind, if this helped the cause of socialism. That was my answer. That is, it was not my opinion; I was merely citing their own leaders, the founders of this system.

[Helen] Well, what do you think about this question now?

[Reagan] Now I think: trust but verify. But now I think that there is a totally different Soviet leadership and totally different relations between our countries. We had very fruitful meetings. Fruitful, I hope, for both sides.

[Question] Mr President, can you name areas in which progress was achieved? Was there concrete progress on the question of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons? Why do you think that you can conclude this treaty this

year, at the same time as the leaders of the Senate are persuading you not to hurry? After all, even this successful summit has not been able to untie the knot.

[Reagan] Well, the leaders of the Senate themselves brought the ratification documents of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. We received them just today. This means that the leaders of the Senate themselves speeded up the ratification. I think that we can count on them acting in the same way if we reach a final agreement on a treaty on strategic offensive weapons.

But I would like to remind you of one thing which I never tire of repeating. A treaty on strategic offensive weapons is immeasurably more complex than the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Therefore, the continuation of discussions on a whole range of issues is inevitable. But when we reach an agreement, which will depend on the Senate, it will then be its duty to study the treaty in detail and ratify it, if they find it satisfactory.

We can hope, I hope, that before the end of the year we can eliminate differences which still exist. But if not, I hope my successor will continue this work, because in this case we are beginning, as it seems to me, the most important reduction that can only take place in nuclear arsenals. The most destabilizing weapons are the intercontinental ballistic missiles which will smash our earth into smithereens only minutes after someone presses the button. That is why not only we expressed our hope for a 50-percent reduction, but the general secretary too, at our first meeting in Geneva, put forward this idea of reducing by half our nuclear missiles.

[Question] Could you possibly list the areas of progress in this sphere, if they exist?

[Reagan] No, I do not think I should speak about this. Discussions are still continuing and a great deal still has to be discussed. I have already said that certain progress has been achieved. Otherwise we would not have continued to speak in the spirit in which we are now speaking.

I think a young girl at the back there would like to ask a question. She seems to be one of the local correspondents.

[Czechoslovak correspondent] Mr President, is there anything in Soviet-U.S. relations that you would advise your successor to reject? And is there something that you would advise him to continue in the future? I'm from Czechoslovakia.

[Reagan] Yes. These negotiations will still be going on. I will do everything to persuade my successor to continue in the same spirit. As a matter of fact, I will certainly tell him that he will find the Russian people most warm, hospitable and friendly.

[Unidentified correspondent] The Soviet authorities have told us that they have files on all the dissidents you met, and that some of those people, or, more precisely, all of them, are certainly not the best representatives of Soviet society. How do you like the fact that there are files on all the people you met, and doesn't that contradict your view of an improvement in the situation in the USSR, and that because of Mr Gorbachev that society has become more open?

[Reagan] No, it doesn't contradict that. The figures themselves reveal that improvements have been made. About 300 people have been freed. The list that we brought with us contains the names of people we were told about by their relatives or friends living in our country. And I have handed that list to the general secretary and have explained why we have a personal interest in their fate. Many of them have been allowed to leave for our country or for other countries that they prefer, such as Israel. So I think there's been a considerable improvement in that area, and we still are going to continue to work in that direction.

[Same correspondent] Sir, what do you feel about the fact that the people you met are now being investigated and might be subject to punishment for it? Mr Gorbachev stressed today that you no longer regard this country as the evil empire. You told him that in the Kremlin. But doesn't the fact that I mentioned contradict your new optimism about the Soviet Union?

[Reagan] No, because, as I say, he took note of the latest list that I brought with me. Previous experiences in respect of a large number of such people show that they are given the opportunity to come to our country. Sam?

[Sam] Sir, yesterday you said that you no longer consider the Soviet Union to be an evil empire. You said that now is a different time, a different period. But what has changed? Is it that Mikhail Gorbachev has become leader of the country, or is it that you have yourself changed, or broadened your idea of the Soviet Union?

[Reagan] No. I think that a great deal of it is due to the general secretary who is, I think, very different from previous Soviet leaders. But also we have continued to draw their attention to these problems and have noticed their readiness to enter into negotiations with us. And I think enough progress has been made so that we can look with optimism on future negotiations.

[Sam] Sir, I think my question specifically concerns what you've seen here that's new. Have you personally changed or broadened your views because you've had an opportunity to find out more about this country and their system during the years of your presidency? Do you regard yourself as taking part in that expanse of change, or is it all exclusively due to Gorbachev?

[Reagan] The merit, of course, lies chiefly with Gorbachev, as the leader. All this is taking place thanks to the change in the country. I read his book, "Perestroika," and found a great deal in it that I agree with.

[Unidentified correspondent] Mr President, at his press conference Mr Gorbachev said that in his opinion you could have achieved more at this summit meeting. In connection with the interpretation of the ABM Treaty specifically, Gorbachev said that you went back on your word, that in Geneva you agreed not to try to attain military superiority. But your adherence to SDI means that you are aiming at superiority in space, and you are thereby going back on your word. Are you seeking superiority in outer space? Can you reach a treaty on strategic offensive weapons without an accord on the SDI and without observing the ABM Treaty?

[Reagan] Some of my colleagues may perhaps not agree with me, because the SDI was wholly my own idea. The aim of SDI is to see whether a means of defense can be created which would make it impossible for nuclear missiles to strike targets in another country. From the very beginning I said that if such a system were created, I would advocate that it should be made available to all countries, because since we all now know how to make nuclear missiles, there is the danger that some madman or fanatic like Hitler could come along and use these missiles. My idea is that at the same time that the SDI is disseminated as a defensive weapon, all nuclear weapons would be destroyed. I hope that if we can get rid of all nuclear weapons it will be a much safer world. This is my dream of the SDI, namely that it can be the tool by which we eliminate all nuclear weapons.

[Correspondent] I should like to continue this topic. Mr Gorbachev said for his part that he did not believe that the SDI is defensive in nature.

[Reagan] I know, he has said that before, too.

[Correspondent] You failed to convince him of that, even though you are now on such good terms with him?

[Reagan] Well, maybe he just does not know me too well, yet. But I said from the very start that SDI is my goal in the defense sphere. It has nothing to do with offensive weapons at all; it cannot kill or maim anyone; it can only prevent missiles from getting through. Now your question, then we will turn to others in the room taking part.

[Correspondent] Mr President, I should like to ask about the intention which you affirmed today, namely your intention to try to achieve a treaty on strategic offensive weapons before the end of your presidency. You have less than 8 months left, whereas Mikhail Gorbachev could have another 20 years to go. So there is some sort of deadline, albeit unofficial, for reaching an agreement. Are you not putting excessive pressure on the U.S. side?

[Reagan] Oh, no, we have set no deadlines at all. I have said that we will continue to work, and I venture to hope that we will maybe fit everything in to the time you have stated. But I am absolutely against any strict deadlines. One can hardly conclude a treaty only because we were set a fixed schedule. A treaty is ready when it is a good treaty, when it is good for all the sides involved. And that is what we will do instead of setting hard deadlines. Then we will be able to say: let's sign, because the time has come. The treaty must be a good one.

[Correspondent] In connection with this, can one speak of a fifth summit meeting which might take place this fall? How can one prevent Soviet-U.S. relations from getting mixed up with our political upheavals? Do you intend to plan a meeting before the end of the election campaign in November?

[Reagan] I think any decision of that sort should be based on an appraisal of the effect it could have on the situation. If it will lead us to success, then one should try to bring it off.

[Male correspondent] Mr President.

[Reagan, in English, not translated into Russian] First the lady, and then I'll take you.

[Femal correspondent] Mr President, one of the Moscow University students asked you yesterday about the practice in the United States whereby the period a president may be in power is restricted. As far as I am aware, you intend to oppose this constitutional amendment next year. Are you aware that the idea of restricting the terms that leaders may remain in office is also part of Mr Gorbachev's reform? Do you think that such an idea is acceptable for the Soviet Union?

[Reagan] I will try to answer that question. [Reagan says in English: "I would hesitate to comment on that"] The system here is one in which there are no nationwide issues upon which all the people would vote for a specific candidate. My disagreement with the constitutional amendment by which we would limit the president to two terms in power is that it is the only office in the country whose candidates are voted on by all the American people. I think that telling people that they have no right to vote for someone only because of a time limitation is a violation of citizens' rights. People have the right to vote for their own candidate as many times as they think necessary. That is the principle of democracy.

[Unidentified correspondent] You have said a lot about it being very important for the students of both countries to meet and to have a better knowledge and understanding of one another. Do you think that your good impressions of the Soviet Union have arisen partly because of the tolerance you have acquired as a result of your meetings with Mr Gorbachev over the past few days?

[Reagan] Well, I have found that Mr Gorbachev and I have developed perfectly satisfactory relations. But at the same time I do not intend to retract my conviction of the need for a verification [proverka] of agreements which we might conclude, and I am perfectly certain that Mr Gorbachev thinks the same.

[Unidentified correspondent] Mr President, as far as I understand it, at your first meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev he proposed a reduction by 500,000 of military servicemen on certain conditions, but this idea was not developed. Was this question raised again, and how did you answer it?

[Reagan] Yes, there was such a proposal. It was proposed to withdraw 500,000 troops each in the European part. This proposal needs to be examined. It seems to me that we are coming to the understanding which Mr Gorbachev is dreaming of: a reduction in conventional armaments in this region, a reduction in conventional armaments together with nuclear ones. A simple reduction of 500,000 men would not exactly reflect the principle of equality, because Soviet troops would be moved back in this instance only a short distance. At the same time, the United States is separated from Europe by an ocean 3,000 miles wide. In the event of an emergency, in order to move our troops into Europe we have to cross the ocean. This is something which has to be considered.

[Unidentified correspondent] In his speech today Mr Gorbachev spoke about your remarks, Mr Reagan, which you made on human rights. He said he was not in raptures over this part of the visit. When you had a one-to-one meeting with the general secretary, it seems to us that you did, of course, discuss questions of human rights. Did he say anything specific to you about the meeting with the dissidents or about the remarks you made in the Danilov Monastery, or yesterday evening at the Union of Writers?

[Reagan] No, but I do know that he and many others formed the impression that our attention to this question is somehow an interference in your government's domestic policy. I have explained to him, and I think maybe he understood the essence of my position that our country is unique. All of us, either by ourselves or through our forefathers, grandfathers or fathers are linked by roots with other countries. We are probably the only nation of this kind in the world. Incidentally, statistics say that one out of eight Americans is an immigrant, or the relative of immigrants from countries in the Western bloc. So I would put it this way. When we get married we don't stop loving our mothers. People in the United States have deep feelings for the countries where their forefathers lived. Among my forefathers I had a great-grandfather who was an immigrant on my father's side, and a grandfather on my mother's side.

So Americans retain that feeling of friendship and loyalty toward the countries where their ancestors lived at one time. When we see that people are treated unjustly,

that they are put into prison for something which is not a crime in our country, requiring such a punishment, our people become indignant and come to us for help, demanding that measures of some kind be taken.

For example, when a wife has been waiting 8 years for her husband to be given permission to leave that country in order to live with her, or when other things of a similar nature take place, we draw attention to these facts. We consider that in this we are not interfering in somebody else's affairs. We consider this to be our affair also. And here we feel an injustice on the part of the government. I explained this position of mine to Mr Gorbachev, and as it seemed to me, he saw the justice of my words. You see many of those whose fate we have already drawn to his attention have been freed from confinement. They were allowed to emigrate to other countries, (?and) in particular to our country.

[Unidentified correspondent] Mr President, Mr Gorbachev said that he proposed a draft statement in which the words peaceful coexistence were used, and he said that your first reaction to this was: I like this. But when you talked things over with your aides and returned to this subject you changed your point of view. Is that so, and why?

[Reagan] I like the general tone of this document and those aims which are set in it. They are the same aims toward which we are also striving. But at the same time I said that I must show the document to my people and I showed it to them. They studied the document and found places in it where dual interpretation was possible which would not facilitate the attainment of what was being proposed in the document. Our side supported the general idea, but our specialists rewrote something. When the full text of the statement is circulated, you will discover that we secured the fact that those ideas which were put down by the general secretary and supported by us have been retained. In the final version they are expressed clearly and intelligibly. This document achieves that aim which was put initially.

[Unidentified correspondent] Tell us, with what did you propose to replace the term peaceful coexistence? What term, in place of this one, did your aides advise for you?

[Reagan] I must say that in our version the aims to which the statement calls remained the same. It's simply that initially, as it seemed to us, it contained certain ambiguities in formulations. I do not think that this was done intentionally. However, this could be used for actions not corresponding with the general aim of this statement.

[Unidentified correspondent] Mr President, I have an additional question on the problem of emigration. When you talked yesterday about a family which was refused the right to emigrate, you called this a bureaucratic problem. You said that bureaucracy is to blame for this. Do you consider that in essence the reason for this problem in the Soviet Union is namely the bureaucracy?

[Reagan] Somebody distracted me at the back. I thought I was talking to him, not to you.

[Same correspondent] Yesterday, when you spoke to the students, you talked about emigration. I'll repeat my question. And you said that, if some were denied the right to emigrate, you blamed the bureaucracy for that. Do you think that the bureaucracy alone is to blame?

[Reagan] I'm afraid that I have to confess: one of the shortcomings of our own machinery, a shortcoming that we have never been able to deal with fully, is the fact that, as soon as it is set up, a bureaucracy regards one fundamental rule as being paramount. The rule says: the bureaucracy must be unshakable. I think that all governments are constantly coming up against the problem of bureaucracy. They have to be very attentive not to find themselves within its power and take the path of least resistance. One government should not be accused more than another.

[Same correspondent] You said that you convinced Mr Gorbachev over emigration. Yet, when speaking about human rights, he stressed that he did not find your arguments convincing. Do you consider this to be a failure at the talks?

[Reagan] I think there is a mistaken view here. I should like to have him come to our country for long enough to enable him to get to know it. I think there is an erroneous view of the things that often dominate the pages of newspapers: racial and religious prejudice in our country, and the so-called street people, people who have nowhere to live. But, you see, these are socioeconomic problems in our country. Of course we have them, and we try to deal with them. But I don't think he quite understand the situation today.

Let's take a young woman living on the pavement in New York. She simply lives on the street in winter and summer. For her own sake, the police take her in so as to bring her to a place that offers women a roof over their heads. But the woman applies to a court and wins the case. She demands to be allowed to go back and sleep on the pavement, since that's what she wants to do. See how far you can go with abusing rights when you live in a free country, a country where everyone can say that this is the way he chooses to live. I think he would understand a great deal if he found out better what's going on in our country.

[Unidentified correspondent] Mr President, in this room on Monday you heard the touching story of people who are imprisoned, of dissidents, and of believers. And later you visited Moscow State University and blamed it all on bureaucracy. Is that really your view, that the reason for these problems in the Soviet Union is just the bureaucracy, and that it is not a deliberate government policy to prevent people from leaving?

[Reagan] No, I can't say that, since I'm not sufficiently familiar with the political system in this country. But the question was presented to me precisely from the viewpoint that bureaucracy hinders people who want to go abroad.

I'll tell you what caused this attitude of mine toward bureaucracy. During the war I once happened upon a situation in which the military wanted to use a warehouse full of filing cabinets. But, for that purpose, they needed permission to destroy the documents. Moreover, they were able to prove that the documents had no historical value and were of no interest to the leadership. They were, in practice, useless. A corresponding document was sent to the appropriate bodies, requesting permission to destroy these completely unnecessary files. Passing through all the bodies, a reply comes down, endorsed by each body, and this is what it says: permission is granted, so long as a copy is made of every file destroyed.

[Same correspondent] Don't you think that by blaming everything on bureaucracy Gorbachev is simplifying the problem?

[Reagan] No, as I said, I formed the impression that such a possibility exists. In any government many of us find ourselves fettered by bureaucratic formalities. Sometimes you just have to stamp your foot and say that I want such and such done. Only in that case can you achieve your aim. I am sure that he is capable of this.

[Same correspondent] Thank you, sir.

[Unidentified correspondent] In preparing for this summit meeting you have since the start of the year been saying that, if progress is achieved on a strategic weapons treaty, you will organize a fifth meeting, but only if a good treaty becomes discernible. You also mentioned this several times today. Based on the results of this meeting do you think that you have achieved sufficient progress, sufficient progress to say today that a treaty on strategic weapons can be concluded still before the end of your term as President?

[Reagan] I can honestly not answer this question. I do not know. Let me just say what the mechanics of this matter are. Our people—the representatives of both sides—are working in Geneva on this treaty. They know what we are striving for. Progress has been achieved there on their work. However, it is difficult to judge the progress. I cannot, at present, order our representatives to complete their work on the treaty by a certain date. One cannot get a good treaty in that way, and I want a good treaty.

[Same correspondent] I have an additional question. Is the achievement of agreement on the conclusion of what you call a good treaty on strategic weapons the only condition for your fifth meeting with Gorbachev?

[Reagan] One cannot definitely say so. New circumstances may always arise which will necessitate us meeting again and settling something else besides this specific treaty. No one can say that there will be no need for a further summit meeting.

Sorry, but when Helen says that, it means that it is time for me to leave.

[Question] Mr President, what have you discovered for yourself as a result of your first trip to Moscow?

[Reagan] I shall answer that question, because I wanted to speak of this. I speak of this whenever I have an opportunity to talk of it. I think that one of the most wonderful forces and sources of stability and goodness that I have discovered in the Soviet Union are Russian women.

Gerasimov, Fitzwater Briefing

PM0206115788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[B. Ivanov report: "We Are Talking With Rather Than About Each Other"—boldface as published]

[Text] It is perfectly possible to achieve a breakthrough at the Soviet-U.S. talks on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons even before the end of the present U.S. Administration's term. This view is shared by leaders of both the Soviet and the U.S. delegations at the talks. Journalists were told this at a briefing by G. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration. This will, of course, be possible, he remarked, only if the diplomats and the military roll up their sleeves.... M. Fitzwater, the U.S. President's press assistant, who took part in the briefing, added that the U.S. side would very much like this treaty to be concluded before the Reagan administration's term runs out and that it intends to work in this direction.

Speaking about the 3d day of talks between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President, the Foreign Ministry spokesman reported that telegrams addressed to the high-ranking interlocutors are arriving from all corners of the Soviet Union. R. Reagan has been briefed on some of them. They reflect the Soviet people's mood and their approval of the changes for the better in relations between the two states. The President had an opportunity to see this for himself during his walkabout in Red Square, when Soviet people gave him a cordial welcome.

During the conversation that took place, the chief of the Foreign Ministry Information Administration went on to say, President R. Reagan asked about the course of restructuring in the Soviet Union. M.S. Gorbachev told him about it briefly. Democratization is the essence of the changes taking place in our country, primarily the democratization of economic life. We have adopted laws on the state enterprise, on individual labor activity, and

on the cooperative system. All this has galvanized our economic life. People welcome these changes even though there are some who are worried that we might create rich and poor people, as in the United States. The process of democratization is also spreading to the party. It includes expansion of the functions of soviets and presupposes juridical reform for the purpose of legalizing the changes taking place. The point of these changes is to activate the potential of the socialist system.

The question of economic cooperation was also discussed at the talks. The Foreign Ministry spokesman noted in this context that the U.S. refusal to grant the USSR most-favored-nation status in trade still remains one of the serious obstacles in this sphere. We recall the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, and it seems that the dead still have the living in their grip, G. Gerasimov said. This amendment links the granting of most-favored-nation status to changes in domestic policy. What if we were to similarly condition our cooperation on changes in U.S. policy toward, say, Mexican immigrants? We must expand economic cooperation. The greater this cooperation, the greater the opportunities for political collaboration.

M. Fitzwater said that the U.S. President is satisfied with the progress at the talks, thinks they are highly productive, and hopes for a good conclusion to the Moscow meeting.

Answering a question by WASHINGTON POST correspondent L. Cannon about what had most impressed R. Reagan in the last few days, the White House spokesman declared that the President is pleased that the atmosphere prevailing between the delegations shows that the USSR and the United States can really do business with one another and can jointly solve the problems facing them. This is obviously why the President, addressing the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said: "Now we are talking with rather than about each other."

Describing the last day of talks in general, G. Gerasimov repeated that serious conversations are going on, at times developing into arguments. He recalled that, during the walkabout by the two countries' leaders in Red Square, someone uttered the Russian proverb: Truth is born out of argument. M.S. Gorbachev responded to this with another proverb: When arguments boil, truth evaporates. In this case, the Foreign Ministry spokesman noted, there was no boiling. The arguments are business-like, which means that the moment of truth may arrive.

Visit to Bolshoy Ballet

*LD0106152888 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT
1 Jun 88*

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan and his wife today attended a ballet presentation at the Bolshoy Theatre.

With them in the government box were Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his wife.

The government box was decorated with the national flags of the United States and the Soviet Union. The orchestra performed the state anthems of the two countries.

Leading ballet dancers performed ballet scenes to music by Tchaikovsky, Glazunov, Prokofiev, Khachaturian, Shostakovich and Drigo.

Activities of Leaders' Spouses Reported

Mrs Reagan Visits Leningrad

*PM0106152888 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Nancy Reagan's Trip to Leningrad"]

[Text] Leningrad, 31 May—Nancy Reagan, the U.S. President's wife, was the guest of Leningrad today.

On Victory Square, she saw the monument to the heroic defenders of the city and laid flowers at the central sculptural group, "The Blockade."

N. Reagan traveled along the Neva embankment, went to the Hermitage, and talked with future artists in the old Italian painting room. The guest visited Petrodvorets and saw its art collections.

She was accompanied on the trip by L.D. Gromyko.

At the airport N. Reagan was met and seen off by V. Ya. Khodyrev, chairman of Leningrad Gorispolkom, and Academician D.S. Likhachev, chairman of the Soviet Culture Foundation board.

Gorbacheva Addresses Peace Groups

*LD3105193388 Moscow TASS in English 1916 GMT
31 May 88*

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—Today the Soviet Women's Committee gave a reception for a group of women representing influential international organizations and movements who are here in connection with the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

The guests were greeted by Zoya Pukhova, chairman of the committee. She said that, despite differences of political views and convictions, the women of all countries are brought together by common striving for dialogue, mutual understanding and cooperation in the name of peace.

The representatives of the world women's movement were addressed by Raisa Gorbacheva. She pointed out an unprecedented political and social activity of women

throughout the world. This is also illustrated, in particular, by the arrival of prominent state, political and public figures heading international and national women's organisations. Women react in a particularly keen and emotional way to the problems which have arisen before mankind, and spare no effort to attain the main goal: to preserve peace on Earth. Raisa Gorbacheva wished the participants in the meeting the joy of life, the light of hope, and clear peaceful skies.

Discussions on the role of women in the present-day world and on the activities of women's organisations ensued. Among foreign participants were Freida Brown (Australia), president of the Women's International Democratic Federation, Margaret Papandreou (Greece), coordinator of the international "Women for a Meaningful Summit" movement, Eleonora Romberg (FRG), chairman of the International League of Women for Peace and Freedom, Najah al-Attar, Syrian minister of culture, and others.

The reception was attended by other women leaders of Soviet public organisations, by women workers, and women prominent in the fields of science, culture and art.

Visit to Art Gallery

LD0106094788 Moscow TASS in English 0924 GMT
1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Nancy Reagan, wife of the U.S. President, examined the "Trinity" icon, a famous work by Andrey Rublev (Russian icon painter of the 15th century). Accompanied by Raisa Gorbacheva, she visited today the depository of the Tretyakov Gallery, the largest collection of Russian and Soviet pictorial arts, numbering some 70,000 paintings, drawings, icons and sculptures.

The Tretyakov Gallery was founded in 1871 by Moscow merchant Pavel Tretyakov who had started collecting pictures by Russian masters back in 1856. In 1892 he handed over his collection to Moscow as a gift. In 1918 the collection was nationalised and was named the Tretyakov Gallery.

The Tretyakov Gallery depository is the Soviet largest storage of pictorial art works. Today it contains some 5,000 icons, 2,000 sculptures and up to 6,000 paintings and other works of Russian and Soviet art. They include such icons as "The Don Virgin" and "the Vladimir Virgin" of the 15th century, "Crucifixion" by Dionisy of the 16th Century, paintings by Repin, Savrasov, Kramskoy, Ge and other great Russian masters of the past century.

The depository is both a storage of art works and restoration studios having the latest equipment. Unique electronic instrumentation maintains here favourable climatic regime.

Four years ago the Tretyakov Gallery was closed: reconstruction of the old and construction of new buildings were launched. The gallery director, Professor Yuriy Korolev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Fine Arts, told TASS that some buildings would be open for public late this year. They will house the exposition "Masterpieces of Tretyakov Gallery". "The whole museum will open in 1990," said Yuriy Korolev.

Reagan Departure From Moscow 2 Jun Reported

Gorbachev Bids Reagan Farewell

LD0206064688 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT
2 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—An official farewell ceremony for U.S. President Ronald Reagan was given in the Kremlin today.

Just like the welcome ceremony, it took place in the Grand Kremlin Palace's St. George's Hall.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his wife Raisa shook hands with Ronald and Nancy Reagan in the center of the hall. Asked by photographers to pose for them, they lingered on there to enable the reporters to take historic pictures.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan exchanged speeches.

Gorbachev Speech at Ceremony

LD0206084588 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0609 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Speech by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev at a farewell ceremony for President Reagan in the Kremlin's Georgiyevskiy Hall—live]

[Text] In an hour's time, you, esteemed Mr President, esteemed Mrs Reagan, will leave Moscow. First of all, I would like to thank you and your colleagues for your cooperation, openness, and businesslike approach to the talks we conducted. I think you and I are justified in regarding both this meeting and your visit as a useful contribution to the development of dialogue between the USSR and the United States of America. You and I, Mr President, have been doing business together for 3 years. We have come a long way from the exchange of the first messages to the completion of this meeting. Our dialogue has not been easy, but we have had both sufficient realism and political will to overcome the obstacles, and switch the train of Soviet-U.S. relations from a dangerous track to a safer one. However, it has been going far slower than required by the real situation, both in our countries and around the world.

Well, as I understand you, Mr President, you are ready to continue our joint work. For my part, I can assure you that we will do everything incumbent upon us to continue moving ahead. Now, with the tremendous experience of Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, and Moscow, and relying on their accomplishments, we are simply obliged to show still more decisiveness and consistency. This is precisely what the Soviet and American peoples, as well as the international public and the entire world community, expect of us.

I hope, sir and madam, that you will have good memories of your stay in our country. When you return to America, Mr President and Mrs Reagan, please convey to the American people the very best wishes from the people of the Soviet Union.

In the past 3 years our peoples have come to know each other better. They have now truly and attentively looked each other in the eye. They have felt more acutely the need to learn to live together on our one beautiful earth.

Bon voyage, Mr President, Mrs Reagan. I wish you and all the members of the American delegation good health. Goodbye.

Reagan Farewell Speech

LD0206085488 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0614 GMT 2 June 88

[Speech by President Ronald Reagan at a farewell ceremony in the Kremlin's Georgiyevskiy Hall—live in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] Mr General Secretary, Mrs Gorbachev: This is an emotional moment for Mrs Reagan and me. We have been truly moved by the warmth and the generous hospitality that we've received from all our Soviet hosts during this brief visit, but most especially from the two of you. During this meeting, as in all of our previous meetings, I appreciated and valued our exchanges and the long hours of hard work that we and our experts put in to make progress on the difficult issues we faced. But this meeting has added something else for Mrs Reagan and me. Our time here has allowed us to know, if only briefly, your art treasures and your people, artists, writers, individuals from all walks of life, people who were willing to share with us their experiences, their fears, their hopes.

Mr General Secretary, it is fitting that we're ending our visit as we began it, in this hall, named for the Order of St George. I would like to think that our efforts during these past few days have slayed a few dragons and advanced the struggle against the evils that threaten mankind, threats to peace and to liberty. And I would like to hope that, like St George, with God's help, peace and freedom can prevail.

Mr General Secretary, if you will permit me just one more proverb, I think a very old and popular saying you have here about last Sunday, the day of our arrival, spoke of the promise that we've seen fulfilled at this summit in this Moscow spring. Truly then: On Pentecost Sunday, the whole forest will open up [troitsa, ves les raskroyetsya].

And now, if I might just conclude on a personal note. Earlier this week at Moscow State University I mentioned to the young people there that they appeared to my eyes exactly as would any group of students in my own country or anywhere else in the world. So, too, did Nancy and I find the faces, young and old, here on the streets of Moscow. At first, more than anything else, they were curious faces, but as time went on the smiles began, and then the waves. And I don't have to tell you, Nancy and I smiled back and waved just as hard.

Mr General Secretary, I think you understand that we're not just grateful to both you and Mrs Gorbachev, but want you to know we think of you as friends, and in that spirit we would ask one further favor of you. Tell the people of the Soviet Union of the deep feelings of friendship felt by us and by the people of our country toward them. Tell them, too, Nancy and I are grateful for their coming out to see us, grateful for their waves and smiles, and tell them we will remember all of our days their faces, the faces of hope, hope for a new era in human history, an era of peace between our nations and our peoples.

Thank you. God bless you.

Reagan Departs Moscow

LD0206072188 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT
2 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan left Moscow today after an official visit to the Soviet Union.

Gromyko, Others See Reagan Off

LD0206075688 Moscow TASS in English 0749 GMT
2 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan has left Moscow for London today upon completion of his official visit to the USSR.

A guard of honour was mustered in Vnukovo Airport. The national flags of the USSR and the USA were hoisted on tall flagstaffs.

The motorcade drove up to the airport building.

Ronald Reagan and Nancy Reagan and the American officials accompanying them went out onto the tarmac.

The band struck the national anthems of the USA and the USSR.

Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Ronald Reagan inspected the guard of honour of the three services of the Soviet Armed Forces—the land troops, the Air Force and the Navy.

Ronald Reagan said goodbye to the Soviet officials.

At the end of the send-off ceremony the guard of honour of infantrymen, airmen and seamen marched to the strains of military march. Marching at the end of the column was the Army brass band.

There were the last handshakes at the ramp. Andrey Gromyko and wife, Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of foreign affairs, Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, bade farewell to Ronald and Nancy Reagan.

A few minutes later the presidential airliner took off for the West.

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and other American officials accompanying the President in the visit have left together with the President.

[Moscow TASS in English at 0815 GMT on 2 June transmits a "corrected version" of this item, omitting the final paragraph]

Gorbachev Sees Representatives of 'World Public'
LD0206120888 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT
2 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—A meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with representatives of the world public has just started in the Kremlin. Activists of foreign anti-war movements, peace organizations, youth, religious and other organizations and friendship societies who came to Moscow in connection with the Soviet-American summit are taking part in it.

The conversation is being attended by Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Praises 'Activists' Role
LD0206130688 Moscow TASS in English 1252 GMT
2 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, began a meeting in the Kremlin with representatives of the international public.

They include activists of foreign peace movements, anti-war organizations, youth, religious and other associations, and friendship societies, who have come to Moscow in connection with the Soviet-American summit.

Speaking to them, Gorbachev said the summit has been more than could be fitted into the program of meetings and talks between the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the U.S. President.

"What is happening between us and the Americans concerns not only us and the Americans, but all people in all the continents, who are worried about where this world is heading," he said.

"You have been real participants in the Moscow summit these days. You have had many contacts between yourselves and with Soviet people and members of the world press. I think this is precisely what you have sought—maintaining a real presence at the Moscow summit," Gorbachev continued.

"I won't speak for the U.S. President for only he can do so. But I can speak for myself and for the Soviet leadership. We thank you for having left off your most urgent, most essential business in your countries and come to Moscow to express your positions," he said.

"In the nuclear age when the price of a mistake in big-time politics has not just increased, but is nearing the absolute, the presence of world public opinion in these politics has more to it than before," the Soviet leader noted.

"I'd say that this is a powerful factor for having these politics filled with moral, humanist contents, and at the same time a guarantee that the policies won't divorce themselves from what they effectively are for—from people, from the concerns of their lives and from their interests."

Gorbachev sincerely thanked those attending the meeting and all those who have sent greetings, appeals and wishes to the Soviet Government and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in connection with the summit.

"Such letters give us inspiration and support. Thank you very much indeed."

Discusses Human Rights Talks
LD0206132588 Moscow TASS in English 1311 GMT
2 Jun 88

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—"The U.S. President came to Moscow, as it seems to me, entertaining notions of times past on some of the issues, including those of

human rights in the Soviet Union," Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in the Kremlin today, addressing a meeting of the international public.

The Soviet leader stressed that at the present summit meeting the Soviet side decided to overcome "its self-consciousness and delicacy which it always manifested when it came to human rights." "We have seen," he explained, "that this does not only harm us but also causes confusion in the minds of people in all countries," since it does not reflect the actual situation with respect to human rights in the Soviet Union.

Mikhail Gorbachev said that he did not agree with the U.S. President's assessments of the state of affairs in the matter of human rights in the USSR. "The facts he cited, do take place. But this is not yet the full picture of Soviet society, he said. Besides, I told the President that we also have a point of view on the state of affairs with human rights in U.S. society and I named these problems and detailed them."

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee reminded the gathering that he proposed to Ronald Reagan to put the dialogue on human rights on a regular basis within the framework of parliamentary contact between the USSR and the USA. At such a regular seminar both sides can express their assessments in detail, exchange information, compare the human rights situations in the USSR and the USA. This will, in the opinion of the Soviet leader, contribute to clarifying the whole situation and "probably, we shall have an opportunity to exchange those positive things that exist in either of the two countries." Mikhail Gorbachev expressed satisfaction with the fact that this proposal was reflected in the adopted joint statement of the leaders of the two countries on the results of the summit meeting. We are prepared to discuss openly all these questions, the Soviet leader stressed.

Urges 'Respect' for Political Choice

LD0206135888 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—Imposing one's opinion on another people means disrespect which is intolerable, unacceptable with regard to large nations and countries, moreover to national minorities, said General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, speaking at a meeting with representatives of the international public in the Kremlin today.

"Let us agree to respect one another, above all, to respect the choice of every people," the Soviet leader said. "I think we cannot tolerate a state of things under which relations among nations in this complicated world be based on something other than respect and trust in every people and recognition of every people's right to make its choice: political, ideological, cultural." We are not imposing on anyone what we are doing, but we shall not

accept any advice as to how we should conduct our affairs. We are inspired more by our own goals and we have no need for a pattern of others, values of others, said the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

All the peoples seek the ways to a better life and it is impermissible not to trust a people, to suspect it of being unable to find this road, Mikhail Gorbachev said. Therefore we reject any lectures addressed to us and are not going to teach any one. The world is not a school where there are teachers and pupils. We all go to school in life and history. And history will show whose values are of the higher standard. There can be no other criterions.

Receives U.S. Church Delegation

LD0206152388 Moscow TASS in English 1342 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—Clergymen of Christian churches from the Soviet Union and representatives of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA met with representatives of the press at the Danilov Monastery here today. The journalists were informed of the joint four-day prayer vigil in Moscow on the occasion of the Soviet-American summit meeting.

"We are grateful to God that he has heard our prayer. We rejoice at the positive results of the negotiations between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan," said Dr. Claire Randall, who leads the delegation of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA.

The joint prayer involved religious workers of 11 churches from the Soviet Union and a group of leaders of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA—a community of 32 protestant and orthodox churches, affiliating about 45 million people.

Representatives of the churches from the two countries sent a joint message to general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President, urging them to make a new step forward in consolidating peace. The message was handed over to the two leaders in the days of the Moscow summit meeting. The guests from the United States were received today by Mikhail Gorbachev amid other public representatives, who arrived in Moscow to promote the success of the summit meeting.

Metropolitan of Minsk and Belorussia Filaret, general secretary of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christian Baptists Aleksey Bychkov and others spoke at the press conference about the importance of joint actions for the preservation of the sacred gift of life on earth.

The American guests said that they were greatly impressed by the openness of Soviet society, the elevated atmosphere caused by the transformations taking place in the country.

"We ask you to pray for us", said Robert White, a member of the American delegation, addressing the representatives of churches from the USSR. "We greatly need that now, on the threshold of presidential elections. We want the new president of the United States to be a man, like your leader—thinking, fully aware of the responsibility for the future, taking care of peace and justice for the whole world."

Yazov-Carlucchi Talks 'Frank,' 'Constructive'

PM0106114388 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 1 Jun 88 Single Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Talks at USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, had a meeting with U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucchi at the USSR Defense Ministry 31 May.

During the talks the defense ministers of the USSR and the United States continued the exchange of opinions in the context of the Soviet-U.S. summit dialogue and on the questions discussed between the ministers in Bern in March this year.

The talks were of a frank and constructive nature.

Carlucchi on Summit

LD0206090088 Moscow TASS in English 0759 GMT
2 Jun 88

[Text] Khabarovsk June 2 TASS—The atmosphere of the Moscow summit meeting was highly positive, businesslike and cordial. This meeting is possibly of much greater significance than the preceding ones, said the U.S. secretary of defense, Frank Carlucchi. He was interviewed by a TASS correspondent in Khabarovsk, where he was today on a brief stopover en route from Moscow to Tokyo.

Frank Carlucchi noted that in the course of the meeting the sides wished to understand each other better. Progress has been made at the talks on questions pertaining to bilateral relations, human rights, regional conflicts and arms control issues. Both sides, he said, have reaffirmed that agreement can be reached on a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive arms and they will carry on efforts in that direction.

"In the course of the forthcoming conversations in Tokyo I will speak about the atmosphere, which prevailed at the summit talks in Moscow, the specific steps made by both countries in the field of arms control, since the Japanese side shows special interest in that problem," Frank Carlucchi noted.

The U.S. secretary of defense made a sightseeing tour of Khabarovsk, a big industrial and cultural centre of the Soviet Far East. Frank Carlucchi watched from the embankment of the Amur River the panorama of the powerful river, along which the border between the USSR and the PRC runs. He laid flowers to the memorial to the fallen in the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945). Frank Carlucchi listened gratefully to the expressions of thanks for the aid given by the American allies to the Soviet people in the fight against fascism.

After a three-hour stay in Khabarovsk, the U.S. secretary of defense and the persons accompanying him left for Tokyo.

Yakovlev Receives Scientific Workers Delegation

LD3106230588 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT
31 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—On the instruction of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received today a delegation of the World Federation of Scientific Workers. It is staying in Moscow in connection with the Soviet-American summit. The delegation handed in a message of greeting to the Soviet and American leaders wishing them to successfully complete the summit meeting.

Wick, Losev Discuss Media Cooperation

LD0106083888 Moscow TASS in English 0739 GMT
1 June 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Sergey Losev, director-general of the Soviet news agency TASS, and Charles Wick, director of the U.S. Information Agency, met here today to discuss the issues of covering life in their countries and ways to further cooperation between the Soviet and American mass media.

It was pointed out that newsmen should play an active role in shaping Soviet-American relations in a spirit of new political thinking.

Wick then familiarized himself with the activities of various TASS services.

Ridgway, Nitze Comment on Joint Statement

LD0106185688 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT
1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—U.S.-Soviet dialogue on human rights has undergone qualitative changes in the past two and a half years, said Rozanne Ridgway, a U.S. assistant secretary of state. She briefly commented on some of the provisions of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement at a briefing at the summit press centre today. Both sides, Rozanne Ridgway said, have a better idea of the interrelation between the state of affairs in this field and the general state of bilateral relations.

During the summit meeting some progress was achieved in preparing the START agreement, Paul Nitze, ambassador at large and special advisor on arms control matters, told the briefing. This applies, first and foremost, to the issues of counting delivery vehicles and to mobile missiles. At the same time, he noted, deep differences remained on many issues, in particular, on verification measures, between the positions of the USA and USSR.

On the possibility of signing the START treaty before the end of Ronald Reagan's term in office, Paul Nitze pointed to the complexity of the issues. At the same time, he stressed, both General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan strive for the signing of the treaty.

Senators Dole, Byrd Hold News Conference
*LD0106163288 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT
1 Jun 88*

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Two U.S. senators today called for further summits and broader parliamentary ties between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Robert Dole, Senate Democratic [as received] majority leader, and Robert Byrd, Senate Republican [as received] minority leader, told newsmen at the summit press centre that there was no doubt the American people wanted peace, arms reduction and good relations with all nations, including the USSR, as it was on the two great powers that the future of the world depended to a great extent.

They said the situation was unique in that it was President Reagan, a conservative, who had achieved great progress in relations with the Soviet Union.

In Byrd's opinion, the two countries should keep up the positive process of improving mutual relations, regardless of which political party wins the presidential election. That should be a slow but constructive process, he added.

Byrd spoke highly of the INF Treaty ratification by U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Answering questions about possibilities of concluding a treaty on offensive arms reductions, Byrd predicted difficulties on its way, as the treaty dealt with a 50-per-cent cut, rather than a complete ban on that whole class of weapons. This, he claimed, bred great problems connected with verification measures.

Dole said he hoped that the administration and the Soviet side would prepare the document for signing before Reagan leaves office next January.

Asked about their opinion of the changes under way in the USSR, the senators said it was evident there were changes for the better.

The Soviet leadership, Dole added, was determined to carry through an economic reform and democratize society.

Further Reportage on Soviet-U.S. Agreements

Search, Rescue Accord Detailed
*LD3105144188 Moscow TASS in English
1412 GMT 31 May 88*

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The Soviet Union and the United States today signed an agreement on cooperation in maritime search and rescue.

The agreement, concluded within the framework of the Soviet-American summit meeting, envisages that each of the two sides, on receiving a distress signal within its search and rescue area, shall adopt urgent measures to extend all possible and most expedient assistance irrespective of the nationality and status of those in danger or the circumstances under which they might be found.

The document sets out principles of the demarcation of the areas of responsibility between the search-and-rescue services of the USSR and the United States and access for rescue units of one side to the territorial waters of the other.

The agreement provides for specific means and channels of communication between the two countries' rescue centres and defines possibilities of conducting communication exercises, and other aspects of cooperation.

The talks between experts from the two countries on this issue began way back in 1985. Early in Spring 1988, the text of the inter-governmental agreement on cooperation in maritime search and rescue was agreed upon on the whole.

Transport Agreement Outlined
*LD0106085088 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1415 GMT 31 May 88*

[Text] Moscow, 31 May (TASS)—An agreement was signed here today, in the context of the Soviet-U.S. summit, between the USSR and U.S. Governments on cooperation in transportation science and technology.

The agreement provides for the sides to develop and carry out cooperation in spheres of mutual interest such as civil aviation, safety in railway transportation, construction of bridges on highways, and traffic safety on roads and highways.

According to the signed document, cooperation will be directed toward solving common problems in transportation, and toward raising the level of safety and effectiveness of the transportation systems in each country.

The validity of the 1972 Soviet-U.S. transportation agreement was broken off by the U.S. side in 1983. In 1986 the United States came forward with a number of suggestions for developing bilateral links, including renewing cooperation in transportation (civil aviation, construction and use of railways, road traffic safety, and bridge construction technology).

Reagan 'Platitudes' on Rights Deplored

PM0106095588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 May 88 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[Summit reportage by T. Kolesnichenko, A. Lyutyy, and N. Prozogin: "Dialogue Continues"]

[Text] The Soviet-American summit in Moscow has found its working rhythm. Talks continued on Monday between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan. Their discussions covered a range of topical problems of the present-day world. As confirmed during the evening briefing at the press center by official spokesmen for both sides, attention was focused on problems connected with the reduction of nuclear arms, although some other matters were also discussed. It was a good continuation of the dialogue. The exchange of opinions took place in a businesslike atmosphere.

White House spokesman M. Fitzwater noted that SDI had been raised. The American President informed the Soviet side of the aims of the program. There was a discussion of prior notification of missile launches, and it was noted that a gradual understanding was being reached in this area. As M. Fitzwater stressed, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz also expressed satisfaction with the definite progress made on the question of monitoring [kontrol za] nuclear tests. In addition, he noted the desire of both sides to step up the work of their delegations at the Geneva talks. The American President is pleased with the progress at these talks.

According to M. Fitzwater, the participants in the conversation highlighted the fact that exchanges and contacts between people are the best way to strengthen friendship between the Soviet and American peoples. That will help eliminate the danger of war. Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, concurred with the spirit of this pronouncement.

G.I. Gerasimov, spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry, reported that the great importance of the ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles by both sides was placed on record. There was a discussion of unresolved problems connected with the preparation of an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons. The Soviet side reaffirmed that we are ready for all-embracing verification of compliance with the agreement, including on-site monitoring. In this connection, it was noted that positions had definitely become closer on the question of monitoring [kontrol za] mobile missiles. There has been progress on

the question of verifying the fulfillment of the convention that is being worked out on banning chemical weapons. In particular, the Soviet side raised the idea of extending monitoring [kontrol] to private, as well as state, chemical enterprises. The American side greeted this with definite understanding.

There is also a good chance of reaching agreement on reciprocal notification of strategic missile launches from national territories. The Soviet side proposed that notification be extended to include launches of air-launched and sea-based cruise missiles and cases where bombers take off en masse. The question of notification of exercises by strategic forces and also that of banning strategic missiles with low-angle trajectories may also be considered.

During the discussion on conventional arms and armed forces in Europe, the Soviet side proposed the reciprocal supply of basic firing data on such weapons in the possession of the two sides, with subsequent on-site monitoring. In the view of the Soviet side, the monitoring would make it possible to finally solve the question of eliminating the existing imbalances in various types of weapons in particular regions of the European theater. Following the elimination of these imbalances, the Warsaw Pact and NATO would be able to reach an accord on the mutual reduction of their armed forces by 500,000 men apiece. That, in turn, would permit armed forces in Europe to be made purely defensive in nature. In short, it was a businesslike day during which progress was made in various areas.

In response to questions from correspondents, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that the American side's unwillingness, manifested in the course of the meeting, to come to an agreement on a number of questions of control of certain types of weapons, especially sea-based cruise missiles, places obstacles in the way of concluding accords on strategic offensive armaments. The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman declared: What sense is there in trying to agree on a reduction of offensive weapons if, as a result of the exclusion of certain types of these missiles from the accords and the deployment of strike systems in space, the arms race could be transferred to new areas?

The President and his wife visited the Danilov Monastery. During the tour of the churches and his subsequent address to the monks, the American President returned repeatedly to the theme of the status of the church in the USSR—the Orthodox Church and other creeds. Church spokesmen provided the necessary explanations in response to his questions and comments on the subject, pointing out, in particular, that in the USSR, the church is separate from the state and each minds its own business. This, of course, does not rule out joint participation in the solution of the problems of Soviet society by believers and nonbelievers, especially now, in the age of restructuring.

Since the Americans are so persistent in raising the human rights issue, it should be observed that to all appearances, in its submission, these rights are being violated in the USSR but not at all in the United States. A news conference held at the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace by a group of American activists led by Karen Parker, nongovernmental expert from the UN Commission on Human Rights, was more eloquent than any commentary on such a peculiar stance on this truly serious issue. The four Americans said they had had a long trek to Moscow to draw the attention of the heads of the two leading powers and representatives of the world's media assembled there to human rights violations in the United States. In their own home, the speakers said, the government simply refused to give them a hearing.

A list compiled by the Center for Constitutional Rights had been brought to Moscow, containing around 100 names of American political prisoners. They also brought a letter addressed to Reagan from American Indians defending their rights. One aim of the visit is to bring about a review of the case of American Indian leader Leonard Peltier, who has been kept behind bars on a bogus FBI charge for 12 years.

Some Western journalists at the news conference tried to cast doubt on the motives of these American activists. "Mr Redner, have you come here to make things awkward for the President?"

R. Redner, coordinator of the committee in defense of Leonard Peltier, replied: "It would be more correct to say that the President is putting us in an awkward position by lecturing other countries on human rights and claiming that everything is fine and dandy in the United States in this area."

Yesterday also saw a "spectacle" at the U.S. ambassador's residence. It is the only word to describe R. Reagan's meeting with the so-called "refuseniks," "dissidents," and other "specially selected individuals." There was one obligatory qualification for the president's guests—they had to be active opponents of socialism and restructuring. And there were around 40 of them there.

What they are can be judged by the example of a certain Grigoryants, who posing before the television cameras after the meeting, looking important, expressed his "own opinion" on restructuring and democracy, "philosophized" about glasnost, and so on. Of course, he had nothing worthwhile to say. In fact, he is an "expert" in quite a different field. If you want to know where to buy some antiques, how much they are, and where to sell them at three times the price, you have come to the right person. However, Western propagandists were interested not in antiques, but simply in "dirt," which is what Grigoryants tried to "sell" them, blatantly overpricing his obviously falsified information.

The speakers did not have to look far either. Kovalev was the first to take the floor, addressing the gathering as follows:

"Ladies and Gentlemen!"

Indeed, the people sitting down to coffee and cakes at the presidential residence had transferred themselves to the category of "gentlemen"—or rather, pitiful extras in a highly publicized spectacle on the theme of the "good American President" fraternizing with wretched "prisoners of conscience" in our country.

Having presented his collection of platitudes on freedom and democracy in our country, R. Reagan concluded his speech with Pushkin's words: "It is time, my friend, it is time." Indeed it is! It is time to stop speculating about the human rights problem and turning this serious issue into a common pretext for self-publicity and politicking. We might well ask America about the situation there regarding freedom and democracy. There are many things, a great many things, that the Soviet people cannot help worrying about in this field. But it requires a serious discussion. We are ready for that. However, at the moment, judging by yesterday's meeting, the American side is not.

And finally—as those trying to cozy up to American propaganda and catch the eye of the President and the U.S. secretary of state were speaking, one had the feeling that what was taking place was absurd. The paradox is that the speakers were talking not about today, but about what happened here yesterday and even the day before. So the president, alas, was encountering not today's reality, but representatives of the past, who are not only uninterested in our future, but are obviously frightened of it. In fact, the more democracy and glasnost we have, the less chance the "dissident" gentlemen will have to gain access not only to the U.S. President, but to low-level American diplomats. Hence their endeavor.

Shishlin Views Results of Summit Talks

LD3105213288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1800 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] [Announcer] Yet another day of the talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan has ended. Nikolay Shishlin, journalist on international affairs, sums up the day's results:

[Shishlin] The 3d day of the Soviet-U.S. summit turned out to be as full as the previous 2 days. An extensive comparison of standpoints is under way on all points of the Soviet-U.S. agenda. And if one is to speak of the atmosphere of the talks, it can be described as business-like and free of any emotional storms that could, quite simply, impede the actual productive discussion of the two sides' approaches. But, of course, one may ask what are the results of these talks? Well, firstly, I would like to say that it is necessary to have patience. And secondly, results are taking shape. They are taking the form of a

series of agreements that will undoubtedly enrich bilateral Soviet-U.S. cooperation. And then, one can confidently expect the completion of work on a joint Soviet-U.S. document that will give an appraisal, a major appraisal, a major appraisal, of the essence of the state of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, but also the essence of the evaluation given by the leaders of the two countries to the present stage of the development of international relations.

And, incidentally, during the discussions, if not breakthroughs then movements to some kind of level of understanding are emerging, and in particular on a key question such as limiting and curtailing the arms race.

Specifically, during the discussion of problems relating to the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons, in compliance with the conditions of the ABM Treaty, in my view a very definite move toward agreement is taking shape concerning monitoring [kontrol] of the so-called mobile missiles. There is also a certain advancement on what relates to a class of strategic offensive weapons such as air-launched cruise missiles. Very slow progress is being made with sea-launched cruise missiles. The Americans would clearly prefer this type of strategic offensive weapon to be completely omitted from discussion. But, of course, if one is to halve strategic offensive weapons, then everything must be cut.

I think that these Moscow discussions give grounds for figuring that we are moving toward agreement with the Americans on conducting experiments at the U.S. and Soviet testing grounds in order to subsequently make progress at full-scale talks on halting nuclear tests. And it looks as though work on an agreement on banning and eliminating chemical weapons will be unfrozen and a fair prospect will open up for broad, major, and bold talks on reducing conventional weapons and armed forces in an extensive zone from the Atlantic to the Urals. In other words, as I understand it, results are taking shape and the results are noticeable—and they are important results.

What I have said also refers to the atmosphere in which discussion of the problems related to regional conflicts is being held. All the more so since a favorable light is, of course, being cast on the discussion of such problems by the events taking place in connection with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, which, in itself, has begun what is of course a difficult and undoubtedly complex process of implementing the Geneva agreements and the planned withdrawal of 50,000 Vietnamese soldiers from Cambodia.

In other words, touching on the work of the 3d day of the summit, one has to say that the summit is moving forward, work is continuing, and it looks as though the results will not be bad at all.

Zagladin, Arbatov, Redman View Summit
LD3105212188 Warsaw Television Service in Polish
1730 GMT 31 May 88

[Interview with Vadim Zagladin, first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee; Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the Academy of Sciences; and State Department spokesman Charles Redman by Witold Stefanowicz and Grzegorz Wozniak in Moscow; date not given—live or recorded; Zagladin and Arbatov speak in Russian with superimposed Polish translation; Redman speaks in English with superimposed Polish translation]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] In Moscow, today was the third day of the Gorbachev-Reagan summit. [passage omitted]

[Stefanowicz] Before the Polish TV camera we have Vadim Zagladin, first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee. Vadim Valentinovich, the first half of the summit is over. How do you assess its course?

[Zagladin] I assess it positively. Things are moving forward—perhaps not as quickly as we would like [words indistinct]. In any case, there is obvious progress. This can be seen by the agreements signed, and the contracts which are being examined. Thank you very much.

[Wozniak] I now introduce Mr Charles Redman, press spokesman of the State Department. Mr Redman, this is your fifth visit to Moscow, accompanying Secretary Shultz, but this is the first time you have been here with the President.

[Redman] That's right.

[Wozniak] Well, we are now in day 3 of the summit. What, in your opinion, has already been achieved [word indistinct]?

[Redman] I think we can say at this stage that it has been a very good meeting. We have had a number of talks already between the President and the general secretary. Today was a continuation. Various subjects are being tackled. Talks by experts on various problems, from disarmament through regional conflicts to human rights, are taking place. I think that the course of the summit indicates that the United States and the Soviet Union have created a permanent system of dialogue, aimed at avoiding elements of surprise to the other side in relations; at enabling a free presentation of the differences separating them but also to carry on a discussion on methods of resolving those differences. I think that this system is the most important change that has taken place in our relations over recent years. We recognize that problems exist, but we have worked out a program for resolving them, in order to achieve progress.

[Stefanowicz] In these—literally and metaphorically—hot days, the most eminent authority among Soviet academics specializing in American problems, Professor Arbatov, has found a few minutes for Polish TV. Professor, what do you think about the course of the meeting?

[Arbatov] It has not been going badly so far. Of course, it is hard to assess it before it is over; but the first documents have already been signed today—documents concerning bilateral relations. The signing of more is envisioned. The most important thing is that, with all the U.S. declarations, we succeeded in getting the agenda on the right rails. So, the most important problems came first: disarmament issues, and they found themselves in the center of attention.

Arbatov Discusses 'Tact' of President, Entourage
LD0106173288 Warsaw Television Service in Polish
1530 GMT 1 Jun 88

[Interview with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the Academy of Sciences, by correspondent Witold Stefanowicz in Moscow; date not given—recorded; interview conducted in Russian with superimposed Polish translation]

[Text] [Stefanowicz] In these hot—both literally and metaphorically—days, the leading Soviet scholar specializing in American problems, Professor Arbatov, has found several minutes for Polish television. Professor, how do you think the meeting is going?

[Arbatov] At the moment it is not going badly. Naturally, it is difficult to make an assessment before it is over.

[Stefanowicz] But the first documents were signed today.

[Arbatov] Yes, documents dealing with bilateral relations; the signing of others is anticipated. The most important thing is that while all the American statements were being made, we managed to direct the day's agenda on to the right track. Thus, we started with the most important problems, those of disarmament, and they were the center of attention. What we proposed—for I do not think the Americans brought much with them; in fact, they may have only brought along a little—what we proposed to them was difficult to reject. It had to be seriously considered.

Our political goal became to mobilize them to take up an entire range of great and serious problems and to make it impossible to avoid them, thus ensuring that this work will continue with the administration of the current President and that of the next.

[Stefanowicz] In your opinion, were the subjects at the summit raised in a proportionally balanced way—the comparison of human rights and the question of dissidents and important disarmament problems, for instance?

[Arbatov] The Americans had such intentions, so that it even looked a bit odd. After all, our country is undergoing enormous changes—the fundamental problem of human rights, democratization of the party, openness, complete freedom of speech, new organizational forms—and in such times, the problems of 3 or 4 years ago are raised. Someone was allowed or not allowed to travel abroad, and he does not want, or is dissatisfied with something, that 202 people were gathered—one can bring people together anywhere. That is proof of the political taste and tact of Ronald Reagan and his entourage. Imagine if Comrade Gorbachev went to the United States and started to talk, for instance, about the Watergate affair; about General Noreiga in Panama; about the accusations of fraud against the President's closest friend, Attorney General Meese; about astrology; and many, many other things. How would it look? I spoke about this on American television. Just imagine, if Gorbachev were to go there and, let's say, set up a kitchen in front of the embassy, with free soup for the homeless. Naturally, we sympathize with the homeless, but how would the Americans see Gorbachev then? As a serious politician or as a demagogue? So everyone tries to act according to his abilities. It is rather difficult for him, you understand; he is an old man now. He occasionally gets sayings and proverbs, topics, names mixed up. Indeed, it is hard to stand such a strain. For example, the chairman of our creative unions allowed 2 minutes apiece for speeches. The outstanding film director Elem Klimov came to me yesterday and said: What can I say for 2 minutes?

[Stefanowicz] Yes, it is very difficult to make a precise assessment at the moment, but I hope you will meet Polish viewers face-to-face after the Moscow summit.

[Arbatov] I will try. I would like to take this opportunity to offer warm greetings and best wishes to Polish viewers. I was in your country recently and took the best memories back home with me.

[Stefanowicz] Thank you, until our next meeting.

OGONEK Editor Says Summit Produced 'Trust'
LD0106093388 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT
1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—"The establishment of the atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding between the USSR and the USA is becoming the main result of the Moscow meeting between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev," holds Vitaliy Korotich, editor-in-chief of the magazine "OGONEK". He spoke today at the press centre of the Soviet-American summit.

In his opinion, a return to the realistic approach in relations between the two states is quite necessary for the development of Soviet-American relations in all spheres, including cultural cooperation.

Shishlin Comments on Summit Discussions
LD3005170388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 30 May 88

[Presented by commentator Viktor Levin]

[Text] I have asked political observer Nikolay Shishlin to comment on today's conversations between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan and on the President's stay in Moscow. Over to you, Nikolay Vladimirovich:

[Begin Shishlin recording] On the whole, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has been proceeding without any surprises. I mean, above all, in its content. Both yesterday's one-on-one conversation between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President and today's talks, during which the delegations met in full strength were, in general, marked by a discussion that was rich in content and constructive. The atmosphere of the Moscow summit literally corresponds to the magnificent weather that has set in in Moscow over the past few days.

What is being discussed? As expected, the center of gravity of the discussion lays in the military political field. It must be said that ideas are being voiced—absolutely just ideas—that the possibilities for resolving major problems in a military way are barred in the world today, that political means must be used.

Furthermore, it must be said that the summit has been proceeding without surprise also in the sense that the U.S. President has remained faithful to his leanings. What I mean is what was observed during his visit to the St. Danilov Monastery in Moscow, where—exaggerating a bit—it could be said that the President arrived in someone else's monastery with an agenda of his own. He made another attempt to teach our priests how they should behave and how church-state relations should be conducted in our country. One could not fail to notice that the President had visitors today who, to put it mildly, are at odds with Soviet law and whose relationship with the law is, so to speak, unharmonious. Well, it is clear who the U.S. President addresses with this gesture. But one would think that such gestures are naturally not instrumental in maintaining the friendly atmosphere that is accompanying the Moscow summit meeting.

And this amazing U.S. passion to teach others from their own experience is, it seems, simply insurpassable. I repeat what I said at the beginning: that on the whole the meeting has been proceeding smoothly, pithily, and productively. Still ahead, of course, is a great deal of work in line with the responsibility shared by the two great countries, the Soviet Union and the United States. [end recording]

Academicians, Shishlin Discuss Disarmament
LD3105173688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 31 May 88

[Report by Vladimir Pasko, Radio Moscow special correspondent, on news conference held by Academicians Arbatov and Sagdeyev and senior CPSU Central Committee employee Shishlin, who are attending the Soviet-U.S. talks, at the International Press Center on 31 May]

[Text] The journalists were addressed by Academicians Arbatov and Sagdeyev and senior CPSU Central Committee employee Shishlin. The overwhelming majority of the questions related to disarmament. It was noted that certain small progress has been attained in a number of directions. Understanding is gradually being reached on the issue of monitoring [kontrol] nuclear tests. There has been a certain rapprochement of the sides' positions at the talks on verification of mobile missiles.

The question of verification of observance of the convention banning chemical weapons, now being worked out, has made progress. As far as conventional arms in Europe are concerned, the experts especially singled out our proposals on making initial data mutually available.

Asked what the novelty of this proposal is, Academician Sagdeyev replied: Of the on-site inspection. Such inspection [proverka] would make it possible to solve once and for all the problem of eliminating the existing imbalances in various types of armed forces and armaments, and this in turn would pave the way toward subsequent reductions of the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO and making them purely defensive.

Numerous questions were asked concerning the remaining differences on sea-launched cruise missiles. Experts stressed that the Soviet side is in favor of monitoring [kontrol] this type of arms, but the United States rejects it.

One U.S. correspondent reminded the experts about the recent speech by Nitze, former head of the U.S. delegation to the Geneva talks, who came out in favor of the USSR and the United States rejecting these missiles completely. The experts said they are aware of this, but that Nitze has many opponents in the United States.

Expressing interest in the course of the talks on regional issues, a number of correspondents asked: Will the USSR and the United States succeed in working out a formula for solving conflicts of this kind? Academician Arbatov said that ever since the question of the start of the Soviet troops' withdrawal from Afghanistan was solved, the U.S. side has considerably lost interest in these problems. This seems wrong to me, he continued, since regional conflicts are continuing, and some of them, the Near East one in particular, are even exacerbated. In the meantime, the Afghan leadership's national reconciliation policy represents a model for solving some of these conflicts.

The Moscow summit meeting, Comrade Shislin stated, in turn, makes it possible to discuss the possibilities for constructive interaction between the USSR and the United States in the interests of overcoming regional conflicts. Impasses, he said, exist not in the practice of international relations but in the minds of politicians. New approaches, realism, flexibility, and new political thinking are necessary.

The participants of the press conference noted that it is still premature to speak of all the results of the meeting, and this concerns regional problems, too. There has been some small progress after 2 and 1/2 days, however. The main thing that is characteristic of the meeting, Academician Arbatov said, is the fact that the sides are engaged not in mutual accusations but in seeking points of contiguity.

Paper Reviews U.S., Soviet News Conferences
PM0206120188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 Jun 88 Single Edition p 4

[Report by Captain First Rank V. Kuzar and Lieutenant Colonel V. Nikanorov under the rubric "Our Special Correspondents on the Moscow Meeting": "Impulses of Hope"]

[Text] The Soviet-American summit has been a major political event. That was how M.S. Gorbachev assessed it during a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. The conference was devoted to the results of the summit, as the 4th day of the President's stay in Moscow was essentially the last working day. The official send-off ceremony for R. Reagan will take place in St. George's Hall of the Moscow Kremlin at 1000 hours on 2 June, and he will leave the Soviet Union.

Soviet television broadcast the news conference live, and our readers can see the text of a report on its work in the pages of their newspaper. As such, we will not retell it, but will only point out that the journalists at the news conference, which lasted nearly 2 hours, had an excellent opportunity to hear a report on the work done at the Moscow meeting from the lips of the Soviet leader. There has been a considered and comprehensive analysis of what was achieved at the talks. The obstacles to progress along the road of resolving the tasks before our countries and the possibilities of overcoming them were noted, and the prospects for a further Soviet-U.S. dialogue were outlined as well. "Do you know what I remember most of all from this news conference?" the Polish journalist Boleslaw Porowski said in a conversation with us. "M.S. Gorbachev's optimism and his determination to continue the struggle to eliminate the nuclear threat and ensure the security of all the peoples."

R. Reagan also gave a news conference yesterday at the U.S. ambassador's residence. Unfortunately, the number of Soviet journalists invited by the American side was

rather limited. Therefore, we had to be content with monitors set up in the international press center. The prevailing atmosphere there allowed us to exchange opinions with our colleagues on the course of the conference: "I am happy that President Reagan saw the results of his visit positively, as a further step forward," the Czechoslovak journalist Lubomir Sisak said. "At the same time, one got the impression that he finds it difficult to come up with answers to questions, for his philosophy is based largely on old conservative positions. In my view, he has yet to understand the processes of democratization in the USSR, and he also misinterprets human rights." Unlike Lubomir, his American colleague Hedrick Smith was brief: "Most of the positions expounded by the President are quite well known and are not new. As a journalist, I didn't get very much from his speech."

The 4th day of the Soviet-U.S. meeting began with the exchange of the instruments of ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Thus, this truly historic document has entered into force, which means that the destruction of Soviet and U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will begin in a month. The complete disappearance of these two classes of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth will be the first real step on the road to a nuclear-free world. The decision on this measure was made at the last Soviet-U.S. summit.

Not confrontation but peaceful cooperation and the pooling of the efforts of various states in resolving global problems and, above all, in ensuring the peoples' security and preserving life on earth—that is the proper azimuth for mankind's move into the 21st century. That came up frequently in conversations with our foreign colleagues, whose place of work these days has been the Krasnaya Presnya press center.

Thomas Shenker, correspondent for THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE, has been working in the Soviet capital for 3 years now.

"Our countries," Thomas said, "are aware of the need to improve their bilateral relations. There is no need to speak of the danger posed by the arms race and the buildup of military strength. It is absolutely clear that our two countries have no choice but to live and work together in this world. Both of us need international stability to put our own houses in order."

"Our next common goal, which is already really visible, is to reduce strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent. Time is on the side of this idea, and a definite public opinion has already formed in the United States about this. I hope," Thomas said in conclusion, "that we are already on a stable path toward improved relations between our two countries."

The fate of peace largely depends on a successful dialogue between the leaders of the USSR and the United States. This statement was made at a 1 June news conference in the summit press center by R. Dole, leader of the Republican minority in the U.S. Senate. We hope the results of the Moscow meeting between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev will give a clear boost to strengthening both bilateral relations and international security as a whole, he added.

For his part, R. Byrd, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, expressed confidence that the positive process of improving relations between the United States and the USSR must develop regardless of which political party comes to power in the White House. We can foresee that this process will proceed not quickly but consistently and constructively, he remarked. Continuing this thought, R. Dole voiced hope that during its remaining months in office, the Reagan administration and the Soviet side will jointly prepare for the signing of an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms.

So, the fourth meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States is nearing its end. It has confirmed the correct choice of path and continued the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. The meeting has also shown that there are still serious problems on a number of questions, both global and bilateral. They can be resolved by collective effort. And on this plane, the Moscow meeting has to a sufficient degree provided impulses of hope, impulses of peace.

Borovik Praises INF Ratification by Senate
LD2805082688 Moscow TASS in English 0808 GMT
28 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—The participants in a news conference at the press centre of the summit meeting applauded an announcement about the ratification of the INF Treaty by the U.S. Senate.

When declaring open the news conference devoted to the participation of Soviet public organizations in the development of the Soviet-American dialogue, Genrikh Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee stated: "I think the USSR Supreme Soviet will not be long in ratifying the treaty".

"We are also gratified," he said, "that the U.S. Senate passed a resolution to the effect that the treaty should be interpreted both now and in the future in the way it was signed on December 8, last year. It is gratifying that all attempts made by the opponents of the ratification of the treaty ended in failure".

Expert on 'Joint Verification Experiment'
LD3105181788 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT
31 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—"The agreement to carry out a Soviet-U.S. joint verification experiment (JVE) to monitor the limitation of nuclear tests has become the

chief result of the work, which was completed during the summit meeting, on issues concerning the termination of nuclear tests," Igor Palyonykh, leader of the Soviet delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on the limitation and cessation of nuclear tests, said here today in an interview given to a TASS correspondent following the signing of the document in the red sitting room of the Grand Kremlin Palace.

Experimental nuclear explosions at the Nevada test range in August and on Soviet territory—in Semipalatinsk—in September this year will become the pivot of the JVE. American specialists are already at the Soviet test range, Soviet ones are at the Nevada test site. In June a new group of Soviet experts will go to Nevada to complete preparatory work for the JVE the purpose of which is to verification methods [as received].

"In our view," two methods of verification—a seismic and hydrodynamic—are now the most promising", Igor Palyonykh went on to say. "The Soviet side has always regarded seismic verification methods as a highly reliable means. Both methods will be tested in Semipalatinsk and Nevada test site conditions".

Following the JVE, the sides will analyze the results of experiments and will work out recommendations to utilize them when elaborating an effective verification mechanism for their 1976 Soviet-American threshold test ban treaty which set a nuclear explosion limit at 150 kilotons.

"The JVE will become an important stage along the difficult way towards the attainment of the ultimate goal: complete ban on nuclear tests", Igor Palyonykh said.

Reagan Receives Petition To Extradite Murderer
LD0106082788 Moscow TASS in English 0730 GMT
1 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Genrietta and Yekaterina Kurchenko, the mother and sister of Nadezhda Kurchenko, have handed in a petition addressed to the visiting U.S. President Ronald Reagan at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow today. They ask him for the extradition to Soviet justice of the murderers of Nadezhda who have found haven in the United States.

...On October 15, 1970 an AN-24 plane with plane number 26256 of the Soviet Aeroflot took off from Batumi on a regular flight to Sukhumi, another Soviet city on the Black Sea coast of the Caucasus. On the fourth minute after takeoff, when the plane was yet only gaining altitude, two passengers holding arms in their hands jumped from their seats and rushed to the cockpit. Nadezhda Kurchenko, a nineteen-year-old air hostess, stood in the way of the air pirates. Shots sounded. Nadezhda was killed and another three members of the crew were wounded. The bandits—the Brazinskas father and son—demanded of the wounded pilots that they

change course and fly to Turkey. The criminals threatened to use their hand grenades so the pilots complied in order to save the lives of passengers and landed at a Turkish airfield.

Despite the Soviet Union's request the Turkish authorities refused to extradite the murderers. The further sequence of events was such: The Brazinskas got an amazingly light sentence, then they were altogether released from custody and given a chance to leave for any country of their choice. The criminals came to the United States in 1976.

The United States Administration either ignores or gives formal replies to the numerous official requests from the Soviet authorities and the even more numerous petitions of the Soviet public as well as letters from Nadezhda's relatives and members of the crew of the AN-24 liner demanding the extradition of the criminals. And this despite the constant talk in the United States about the need of joint struggle against terrorism, in particular against hijackers.

When speaking at a press conference at the close of his visit to Moscow in April of this year the United States secretary of state said concerning the hijacking of a Kuwaiti airliner that it should be remembered that the terrorists had not only hijacked the plane but also committed murder and that such criminals should be denied shelter anywhere.

In one of her letters to Ronald Reagan Genrietta Kurchenko wrote: "Mr President, imagine that such a tragedy happened with one of your children. What feelings would you have for the leadership of the country that gave shelter to the murderers of your child?"

Americans' Letter Writing to Gorbachev Lauded

PM3005151588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian

30 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "'Bridge-Building'"]

[Text] The book "Americans Write to M.S. Gorbachev" [Amerikantsy Pishut M.S. Gorbachevu] was launched 29 May at the Soviet-U.S. summit press center. Discussing it, V. Korotich, chief editor of the magazine OGONEK, noted that here we are dealing with a previously unimaginable readiness on the part of U.S. citizens to discuss their problems not only with their own President, but with the leader of our country. This is not a book of complaints about America, it is a model of popular diplomacy and meditation about the realities of our time, he stressed.

In the opinion of A. Avelichev, director of the "Progress" Publishing House, the book gives the fullest picture of U.S. public opinion. So far, he said, the general secretary has received more than 100,000 letters.

Professor S. Cohen, the well-known U.S. political scientist, believes that the appearance of the collection marks a new form of contact between the United States and the USSR. The scholar described this process as "building bridges" between our peoples, bridges which, unfortunately, were blown up during the seventies.